

Troy; and Kesker, Gillett & Porter, of Towanda, all in the State of Pennsylvania, against a tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Thomas W. Jones, the City Real Estate Co., Olin G. A. Barker, W. J. Fenn, G. W. Kepple, W. K. McHenry, the F. L. Meyers Real Estate Exchange, and Charles E. Hays, all of Johnstown; Thomas Kirschner, of New Florence; H. B. Follmer, of Elton; Edgar L. Brenneman, of Roaring Springs; W. H. Farnsworth, of Jenners; M. B. Cowher, of Patton; B. E. Phillip, of Dunlo; M. L. Yingling, of Lilly; C. H. Perry, of Chester Springs, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against war tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Papers to accompany bill granting pension to Mrs. Clara B. Hatfield; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Women's Party of Cook County, Ill., praying for justice and equal opportunity to all citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Chamber of Commerce, protesting against tax on sale of grain, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of O. Frank, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOPER: Petition of Wisconsin Pharmaceutical Association, protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against taxing sales of grain; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Citizens' Bank, of Delavan, Wis.; the Delavan Lake Boat & Engine Co.; and Nelson & Sweeney, of Argyle, Wis., protesting against war tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURRY: Petition of 105 people of Richmond, Cal., protesting against national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the William Wrigley, Jr., Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against war tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Labor Council of Greater New York, asking the United States Government to act most vigorously against the continuation of the war in Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of William Peter Brewing Co., of town of Union; of Hudson County Consumers Brewing Co., of West Hoboken; of Daniel Bernes Boulevard Brewery, of Union Hill; of Trefz Brewery, of Newark; of Paterson Brewing & Malting Co., of Paterson; of Gottfried Krueger Brewing Co., of Newark; of Christian Feigenspan Brewery, of Newark; and the Peoples Brewing Co., of Trenton, all in the State of New Jersey, protesting against the increase from 50 to 75 cents per barrel on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring creation of a national bureau of health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HENSLEY: Petition of sundry citizens of De Soto, Mo., against exportation of food products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition of A. A. Lueck, John McCarthy, J. F. Albers, R. J. Leutscher, Charles O. Gauthier, of Antigo, Wis.; Woerfel & Stiles, of Sturgeon Bay, Wis., and F. M. Charlesworth, of Kaukauna, Wis., protesting against war tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOBECK: Memorial of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring creation of a national board of health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Guy L. Smith, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the State Pharmaceutical Association and legislative committee of the Omaha Retail Druggists, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the manufacturers of Velvetina toilet preparations, of Omaha, Nebr., protesting against tax on cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of C. Christensen, of Milton-on-the-Hudson; R. A. Austin, of Cairo; Jafael Bros. and Jordan & Marsh Drug Co., of Liberty, all in the State of New York, protesting against proprietary tax on medicine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MERRITT: Telegram of W. H. McKenna, of Cha-teaugay, N. Y., protesting against proposed stamp tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of F. M. Hopkins & Sons, druggists, of Keeseville, N. Y., opposing proposed tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of the Orange Judd Co., New York City, against the passage of House bill 16238, to amend the copyright laws; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, protest of Doubleday, Page & Co., New York, N. Y., against the passage of House bill 16238, to amend the copyright laws; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of sundry citizens of St. Albans, Me., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, October 12, 1914.

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bristow	Hollis	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	James	Overman	Smoot
Burton	Johnson	Page	Sterling
Camden	Jones	Perkins	Thornton
Chilton	Kern	Pomerene	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lane	Reed	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	McCumber	Robinson	Vardaman
Culberson	McLean	Shafroth	West
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	White
Gronna	Norris	Simmons	Williams

Mr. PAGE. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. He is paired with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. THORNTON. I desire to announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. RANDELL]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND], and the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF]. The senior Senator from New Hampshire is paired with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN], my colleague is paired with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE], and the junior Senator from West Virginia is paired with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN].

I desire also to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and of the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH]. The junior Senator from Maine is paired with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. SHIPLEY and Mr. SMITH of Georgia answered to their names when called.

Mr. SWANSON, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. WEEKS, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. STONE, and Mr. COLT entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-nine Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

AUTO TRUCKS FOR POSTAL SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 598).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Postmaster General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, an abstract of bids and other documents called for, together with memoranda of the purchasing agent for the Post Office Department and of the postmaster at Washington relative to the purchase of six White trucks for the use of the Washington City post office, which, on motion of

Mr. TOWNSEND, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 12161. An act to remove the charge of desertion against John Mitchell; and

H. R. 13296. An act for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GRONNA. I present two telegrams in the nature of memorials from the president and secretary of the Druggists' Association of District No. 7, and from the secretary of the North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association and field manager of 15 local organizations, in my State, remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines. The telegrams are very important and brief, and I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK., October 11, 1914.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Kindly oppose the imposition of a war tax on proprietary medicines and cosmetics, because this is a discriminative tax on retail druggists alone.

DRUGGISTS OF DISTRICT NO. 7.  
WM. P. PORTERFIELD, President.  
OSCAR HALLENBERG, Secretary.

LISBON, N. DAK., October 8, 1914.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, Washington, D. C.:

We hope you will see your way clear to oppose the imposition of a war tax on proprietary medicines and cosmetics, because this is a discrimination tax, and if it becomes a law will be borne and paid entirely by the retail druggists.

W. S. PARKER,  
Secretary of the North Dakota Pharmaceutical Association  
and Field Manager of 15 Local Organizations.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram from J. E. Sandlie, of Lidgerwood, N. Dak., remonstrating against the proposed tax on automobiles, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIDGERWOOD, N. DAK., October 8, 1914.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA, Washington, D. C.:

A special war tax on automobiles assessing 25 cents per horsepower against each automobile owner and assessing \$1 per horsepower on each car manufactured—such a measure means an enormous loss to the entire automobile industry. We have 17,000 automobile owners in the State and over 1,000 automobile dealers and they are all protesting vigorously against such a measure.

Yours, truly,

J. E. SANDLIE.

Mr. GRONNA presented telegrams in the nature of memorials from B. L. Bentson, of Fargo, N. Dak., on behalf of the druggists of North Dakota; of H. E. White, W. N. Smith, H. W. Kelly, Clemens Drug Co., and Wonnemberg & Avis, of Jamestown, N. Dak.; of Edwin L. Newcomb, secretary of the Northwest Branch of the American Pharmaceutical Association, of Minneapolis, Minn.; and F. S. Baker & Co., of Keokuk, Iowa, remonstrating against the proposed tax on proprietary medicines, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I present a large number of telegrams, in the nature of memorials, and also sundry letters, from citizens in my State, remonstrating against the proposed tax on drugs and proprietary medicines. I move that the letters and telegrams be received and lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present a large number of telegrams, in the nature of memorials, from constituents of mine, protesting against the imposition of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines. The telegrams are from citizens of Jersey City, Clinton, Somerville, East Orange, and Ocean Grove. I ask that they be received and properly noted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The telegrams will be received and ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed tax on proprietary medicines, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed tax on telephone messages, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the proposed tax on proprietary medicines, which were ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BRISTOW:

A bill (S. 6628) granting an increase of pension to George F. Weitzel (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 6629) granting an increase of pension to John G. Avery (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 6630) granting an increase of pension to Smith C. Hotchkin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES:

A bill (S. 6632) granting a pension to Benjamin Matlock (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. For the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] I introduce a bill which is regarded as very important, and I ask its reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations. The report which I made at the third session of the Sixty-second Congress, being Senate Report No. 1267, accompanies the bill, which is similar in form to the one reported at that time.

The bill (S. 6631) to regulate the practice of pharmacy and the sale of poison in the consular districts of the United States in China was read twice by its title and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### PUBLIC BUILDING AT LA JUNTA, COLO.

Mr. SWANSON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12665) to increase the limit of cost of public building at La Junta, Colo., reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 817) thereon.

#### EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. SHAFROTH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 470), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate be authorized to approve a voucher for reporting a hearing before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held on April 17, 1914.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent to call up a resolution which I submitted on Saturday last and had referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, which was subsequently reported favorably by me from that committee.

It is the ordinary resolution authorizing the Judiciary Committee to take evidence. The original resolution as it now is upon the record is so drawn that the evidence can only be taken while Congress is in session. This resolution proposes to extend the authority to take some evidence during vacation; it proposes to confer that general right; but, as a matter of fact, it is only to be exercised in one case in reference to a bill which is before the Judiciary Committee. Probably the taking of the evidence which is proposed will not consume a day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I shall not object, provided there is no discussion; but after this matter is disposed of I shall insist upon the regular order.

Mr. REED. The Senator from North Carolina will understand that I spoke to him about this matter on Saturday.

Mr. SIMMONS. But I did not understand that it was going to give rise to any debate.

Mr. REED. I think it will not. I think the matter will go through by unanimous consent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 469) reported by Mr. REED from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate on October 8 (calendar day, October 10), 1914, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized, during the Sixty-third Congress, to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject that may be pending before said committee, and to have such hearings printed for the use of the committee; that the expenses of such hearings be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the said committee and all subcommittees thereof may sit during the sessions of the Senate.



Resolved further, That the said committee or any subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to conduct said hearings and investigations in the city of Washington or elsewhere as it may deem proper, and may continue such hearings and investigations during any recess of said Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask if the resolution is directed with reference to hearings which have already been begun before a subcommittee?

Mr. REED. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

#### AMERICAN VESSELS AND WATCH OFFICERS.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator from North Carolina will yield for a moment, I wish to state that on Saturday last I submitted a resolution calling for certain information from the Secretary of Commerce. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] objected to its consideration, and thinks that the resolution should be referred to a committee. I simply desire to ask that the resolution be taken from the table and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SIMMONS. There will be no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution referred to by the Senator from Washington will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 467), as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce be requested to furnish to the Senate the following information:

1. How many Americans were shown by reports from the various customs districts to be available for watch officers, including masters, mates, and engineers, when the order suspending the requirements of the navigation laws relating thereto for a period of seven years was issued.
2. Copies of letters and communications on file with the department relating to the supply of Americans available for watch officers on ships admitted to American registry.
3. A list of the vessels admitted to American registry under the emergency act, with a statement as to where and when built, by whom owned, what flag heretofore flying, and the number of American vessels and watch officers employed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

#### THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I received this morning a letter from a lady constituent of mine in Alabama bearing on the cotton situation in the South. I think it is the most interesting and instructive letter I have read on the subject, and I ask to have it printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

TUSKEGEE, ALA., October 8, 1914.

DEAR SIR: I have read quite a great deal about the cotton situation and the plans for financing the crop and reducing the acreage for 1915. It seems that no plan has been devised that meets the requirements of all the parties concerned, and unless the acreage reduction is made on a basis fair to all growers, great and small, it will not only be very unsatisfactory but prove a failure, for doubtless many who talk reduction will perhaps reduce their apparent acreage, but have an interest in the acreage of other parties who will not reduce—so as to offset their apparent reduction and to not plant any cotton at all is a course too improbable to be worth discussing.

It seems to me a better plan would be to concentrate all efforts on a system of bonded warehouses in all the cotton-growing States for the purpose of holding enough cotton off the market to materially raise the price of what remains to be sold.

It is said that cotton a year old is better for spinning purposes than raw cotton, and that cotton does not deteriorate in three to five years. Then it seems to me it would be a wiser course to set aside what is estimated to be a surplus of this year's crop, take it completely off the market, and not sell it under any condition. Then, when the spinners and manufacturers find that to wait for low prices or an unloading of "distressed cotton" on the market is useless, they will begin to buy, and a fair price will be obtained.

This could be accomplished by forming "cotton-holding corporations" in each State, with bonded warehouses and sufficient capital to buy up and properly insure such cotton at at least 10 cents per pound, which price has been obtained by the "buy-a-bale-of-cotton" movement. The number of bales in this reserve supply should be a certain per cent of each State's production, so as to be fair to each State; and when selling begins at a fair price the reserve cotton could be released by certain per cent from each State so that one State would not profit more by the "holding movement" than a sister State. Also arrangements could be made for a planter to store his cotton with this "holding corporation" for a reasonable charge, without selling outright.

Don't you think a system like this would be worth more than futile attempts to decrease next year's cotton acreage 50 per cent or even 25 per cent? Because it won't be done systematically or satisfactorily.

As to leaving out cotton and raising foodstuffs in large proportion, Mr. Tait Butler in (September 26) Progressive Farmer covered that ground to my idea. There would be "no market," and the South has no facilities to handle such crops, no machinery to work such farms on a large scale, no storage houses, etc., and the cost of such things would be prohibitive of such experimenting in raising foodstuffs. Besides food-

stuffs won't keep like cotton, and there would be too much competition to guarantee the South a market for foodstuffs in one year. Cotton is the South's money crop, and a small farmer could manage better with cotton at 7 cents a pound than on foodstuffs for which he had no sale.

Diversification of crops is all right and ought to be preached day in and day out, but to expect to revolutionize a whole section's crop system in one year is chimerical. The tenant farmer pays his rent in cotton; the price cuts no figure with him as far as the rent is concerned. He pays in a certain number of bales. What is over the rent is his concern. A great many tenants couldn't grow enough foodstuffs to pay rent equal to cotton, nor would a landlord rent land on those conditions. Nine out of ten would "take a chance on cotton."

Now, with the plan to form "holding corporations" in each State, all surplus cotton could be brought up and stored for next year's sale—unless some unprecedented demand arose at such price as to cause a sale a little later on. Then next fall sell the 1914 reserve, or 1-year-old cotton, and put back a like reserve out of 1915 crop for 1916 sales; thus you could handle the situation and be a crop ahead each year, so if the boll weevil becomes a disturbing factor it would be better to have next year's crop and store it than not to make any crop or a small crop and then be confronted with a demand for cotton, due to expanding trade relations and a cessation of the present war and a resumption of trade on the part of foreign countries. As Mr. W. P. G. Harding said he believed underproduction next year would be worse than overproduction, etc. True, it would be better to have the crop and store in the bonded warehouses with proper insurance, and be ready to meet any trade emergency, rather than—to quote Mr. Harding—make "the trade dependent" upon the present crop for the greater portion of its two years' supply.

For this plan would not disturb farmers in their plans for next year, and the time wasted on preaching acreage reduction could be better spent gathering information as to the farmer's actual needs and to show farmers the best way to get started in a small way to diversify their crops, for nine out of ten are going to hang to cotton, for it pays the rent regardless of price, and has been and will be the money crop of the South.

To tax cotton production will not answer, for few would agree to the right of State or Government to tax one's individual right to raise what he pleased. Such a tax would about crush the small grower, for while cotton may be low in price, he would have to pay high for foodstuffs and manufactured articles, etc., besides the tax.

As to live-stock raising: Very few farmers could buy the cattle to stock a farm or could find them to buy in this section, and then it is three to five years before much can be expected from that investment, and the element of death by disease and uncertainty as to increase of herd would make many hesitate. Scattered efforts here and there would not count for much.

A holding corporation in each State, if properly managed, would eliminate all this talk and multiplicity of plans and could be made a permanent factor in handling the cotton crops of the future. When farmers know they have an organization back of them strong enough to sustain the price of cotton, and manufacturers know that cotton can be bought only at fair prices, the disposal of the cotton crop would not be "haphazard," as it is now, and the price low until it is out of the farmer's hands and into the "middleman's." This holding corporation, composed of farmers, manufacturers, bankers, financiers, etc., could deal directly with the farmer and directly with the manufacturers through their agents, not in the sense of the so-called middleman, but as an avenue of trade, be a means to an end.

Now, with other uses for cotton being thought out, such as bagging for baling cotton, sacks for produce, and the demand for cotton-made goods, etc., all of which will increase the demand for cotton—why reduce the 1915 crop, when cotton properly stored does not deteriorate in value in three years or more, and the boll weevil promises to be a factor in reducing the crop for the next year or two, and the demand may exceed the supply, should the war end soon? It would be better to have a reserve supply with these facts before us rather than a reduced crop in 1915.

I should not think it would be difficult to form these "cotton-holding corporations" of responsible persons in each cotton State, with uniform rules and sufficient capital to insure success of the movement. These corporations would be more or less profitable according to the rules governing their formation.

Responsible persons could be found in each county to boost this movement and explain to farmers and landlords and others what the movement means to the cotton producer now and in the future. Then let the farmers register by counties the number of bales they want to sell, the number they can hold, etc., and in what way they can and will diversify their crops. Find out about the man who is the actual producer, then you will know better how to relieve the situation for him and for all others interested. Farmers will be willing to register if given the assurance from responsible sources that their interests will be protected.

And I should think industries begun now in the United States to make the articles formerly imported—which supply has been cut off by the war—should be protected from foreign imports, even should the war end soon, until they are in a position to compete with foreign-made goods. Such assurances of protection would build up new industries for America and make her, as she should be, independent of every foreign nation.

"Made in the United States of America" should be our slogan from now on. "Home production for home consumption."

MISS MARY L. LEE,  
211 North Elm Street, Tuskegee, Ala.

#### EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

The Senate, as in Committee on the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Before the Senator from Utah begins his speech, I desire to give notice that after he has concluded I shall ask unanimous consent that a vote be taken upon the pending measure on Thursday of this week.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One moment. May I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he is prompted in that suggestion by the desire to obtain an early adjournment?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is my motive; yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand that the Senator from North Carolina is going to ask unanimous consent for a vote at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not now asked for that unanimous consent; but, in order that Senators might be present, I simply gave notice that I should ask it at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to say that if unanimous consent is asked I shall object. I am not going to agree to unanimous consent unless something is done to relieve the cotton situation in the South.

Mr. JAMES. The sooner we can get a vote on the pending bill the easier it may be to get relief for the cotton planters of the South. There is to be no condition in this unanimous-consent agreement, for which the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] intends to ask, that we shall adjourn on Thursday. It is merely that we shall vote on the pending bill on Thursday.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky that, if the Senate is to be kept here for the next two months in the discussion of the question of relief for the cotton growers of the South, perhaps that will have some bearing upon how quickly we shall get through with the pending measure.

Mr. OVERMAN. I want to say to the Senator that there is an amendment being prepared to be presented to the pending bill which will, I think, help our people in their distressed condition. All we want is time to prepare that amendment to be submitted; and as soon as it is voted on, if it is voted down, we will make no further objection.

Mr. JAMES. I did not suppose the Senator from Utah would take the position that he would oppose the consideration and passage of just and proper legislation because he was opposed to some other legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not know why the Senator should construe what little I said in that light.

Mr. JAMES. It is susceptible of no other construction.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think I understood the Senator from Utah. His impression was, I understand, that I referred to a separate bill; I did not.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I understood the Senator to mean.

Mr. OVERMAN. What I mean is that there will be an amendment offered to the tax bill which we think will solve this question. All we want is a vote on it, and when the vote is taken we are willing to quit and adjourn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I want to say this—

Mr. OVERMAN. Until that amendment is prepared and ready to be offered, I will not agree to fix a time to vote on the bill; and so far as Thursday is concerned, I will not now consent.

Mr. JAMES. I presume the Senator could have the amendment ready by Thursday.

Mr. OVERMAN. We will have it ready; yes. But I do not want to be bound so that we can not have a vote on that amendment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator will have an opportunity to secure a vote on the amendment to which he refers.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me ask the Senator from North Carolina if the amendment to which he refers is being prepared by the Finance Committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; it is being prepared by some Senators from the South.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And are we to be given to understand that until that amendment is considered the tax bill will not be passed?

Mr. OVERMAN. I mean that I am not now going to consent to a vote on Thursday, because if we did we would be bound by the unanimous consent and precluded from the discussion of the amendments; if we are ready and the amendments can be discussed, then we will vote on Thursday. In other words, I do not want to be bound in such a way so that we can not be heard on an amendment to this bill; that is all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do not understand, Mr. President, how the Senator would be precluded from offering an amendment to this bill even if unanimous consent is given to vote on Thursday.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator can offer an amendment to this bill at any time he desires.

Mr. OVERMAN. If I agreed to a vote on Thursday, the amendment might not be prepared and ready to be offered on that day, and then it would be cut off. I will probably not offer the amendment myself, but it will be offered.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I understand the question of unanimous consent is not now before the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply gave notice that I would make the request.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I call for the regular order.

Mr. SIMMONS. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah is entitled to the floor.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the claim that this bill to raise over a hundred million dollars in the way of direct taxes on the people is solely attributable to the war in Europe is not true. It is due greatly to the condition of affairs in this country, brought on by the mistaken legislation of the Democratic Party in Congress and the unjustifiable extravagance in appropriations. If the tariff law as it existed before the passage of the Underwood Democratic measure had been left alone and business carried on under a Republican administration and with a Republican Congress, there would have been no trouble whatever. The country was unusually prosperous when the Democrats, by a division in the Republican ranks, secured control of the Government. They promised all sorts of reforms and have kept Congress in almost continuous session, with a result of imposing enormous additional burdens in the way of direct taxation. In addition to the income tax, they now propose to levy considerably more than a hundred millions on the plea of the war in Europe. The United States is not at war with any country. With the war preventing exports from Germany and Austria, and limiting those from the United Kingdom, France, and Russia, the United States should be in a position to profit instead of adding this enormous burden of taxation. But it is not in that position simply because of the absolute failure of the Democratic tariff law and other legislation enacted since that party came in control of the Government. The plea that the war in Europe makes this legislation necessary is a shameful pretext.

I will admit that the outbreak of the European war at a time when the Democratic Party's fiscal policies had proved a failure and brought the administration to a point where, in order to meet the extravagant and ever-increasing appropriations, the usual Democratic bond sale had to be made or additional direct taxes imposed upon an already overburdened and overtaxed people, has given the party a new hope against a severe rebuke at the polls this fall. All hope of success had vanished before the declaration of war. War is to be the excuse in this campaign for every Democratic blunder, every extravagant appropriation, every piece of vicious legislation. It is to be the Democratic Mother Hubbard, to cover everything and touch nothing. The evil effects of the Democratic economic policies were acknowledged by millions and felt by all long before the war. While the Democratic Party finds itself the beneficiary of the unjustifiable and wicked war, I want every producer of goods in the United States to know that he, too, will be a temporary beneficiary, and I hope that the producers of commodities of every kind will prepare to take advantage of the opportunity, even though it comes to them through no action of the party in power, but through the misfortunes that have befallen the people of Europe. Never in the world's history has there been such a dreadful sacrifice of human life and wicked destruction of property. America will be called upon to furnish goods to the former customers of the belligerent powers. She will be expected to furnish food and supplies to the belligerents themselves, and, greater than either, we must produce the goods required by our own people. Horrible as the war is, it will temporarily neutralize the blight to our own manufacturing institutions caused by the Democratic tariff law. American producers should have prosperous times for months to come and until the war ceases and European industrial plants again become productive. But when that time arrives there will be made a renewed and vigorous effort on the part of the warring countries to capture the American market. We may think we have had sharp competition in the past, and we have; but it will be keener and sharper after the war, for the poor people made poorer and the rich and well-to-do reduced to poverty by the ravages of war will be compelled to work, and the question of the amount of wage will be a secondary consideration. No Senator has quoted more approvingly the editorials of W. R. Hearst, a prominent Democrat, than has the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHVEST], and while he was addressing the Senate last Friday, picturing the wonderful accomplishments, as he thought, of the present administration, and offering most ingenious excuses for its failures, I thought several times like asking him to read the signed editorial by Mr. Hearst appearing in the Chicago American September 20. I concluded it would hardly be fair to him to do so; but the editorial gives such good advice to his party, and covers the war excuse for imposing another burden on the American people of over \$100,000,000



so well, that I will present it to the Senate myself and beg that my Democratic friends will ponder over it well. I now quote it:

MOST PEACEFUL NATION IN THE WORLD IS ASKED BY FREE TRADERS TO PAY A WAR TAX OF A HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS.

[William R. Hearst, in Chicago American, Sept. 20.]

The most peaceful nation in the world is to be asked to pay a war tax of a hundred million dollars. The United States is not at war, and is not in reality a sufferer from the European war.

The necessity for this tax is not created wholly by the war in Europe, or even mainly by the war.

The deficit in the income of the United States Government is due partly to the reduction in the amount of the imports into this country, but also largely to a reduction of the tax upon imports into this country.

The reduction in the amount of the imports the party in power at Washington is not responsible for, but the reduction in the amount of the tax on imports the party in power in Washington is responsible for.

The reduction in the amount of foreign imports is not a disadvantage. On the contrary, it is in many respects a distinct benefit to our country. The reduction in the amount of income from these imports is obviously a disadvantage and a distinct disadvantage at this time.

It would appear, therefore, that the party in power in Washington was not responsible for such benefits as there are in this present situation, but was and is responsible for the disadvantages of the situation.

Why can not the Democratic Party frankly confess that its free-trade theories are a mistake, have always proved to be a mistake, and are now proving to be a mistake?

Why can not the Democratic Party, which has many claims upon popular confidence, abandon the visionary and impractical policies which will, if persisted in, forever deny it popular confidence and support?

War or no war, the Democratic Party's tariff policies were proving failures.

Before war in Europe was declared or even contemplated, the balance of trade was showing immensely against this country. Our export balance had decreased over a quarter of a billion dollars in seven months. Gold was being exported in quantity.

The income tax had proved insufficient to compensate for the reduction in the tariff revenues.

Foreign goods were coming into our country, perhaps not in sufficient quantities to raise an adequate governmental revenue under the reduced rate of taxation, but certainly in sufficient quantities to deprive our American laborers of employment.

American men out of employment were parading the streets. American business men in bankruptcy were putting up their shutters.

American factories were closing and discharging their employees, and, instead of America shipping more goods abroad than before the reduction of the tariff, America was importing more and shipping less, with the balance of trade going more and more to our disadvantage.

Then comes the European war, and through no effort or merit of our own, European goods are withheld from our markets and our home markets are again open to our home manufacturers.

Another consequence of this European war is the opening of foreign markets to our products.

Markets which were formerly supplied with goods from England and France and Germany and Austria will not be supplied from those nations, and must be supplied with goods from the United States.

The advantage of markets is clear and conclusive. Markets are merely the demands for our products. Without the demands there can not be a sustained supply, and with enlarging demands there must ever be enlarging supply, increasing production, increasing employment, and increasing prosperity.

We could have kept our home markets with legitimate protection.

We could have gotten enlarged foreign markets with judicious reciprocity.

We did neither.

But what we failed to do for ourselves the war will do for us.

Yet to take full advantage of the opportunities which the European war offers to this neutral Nation those opportunities should be made as permanent as possible by intelligent legislation and diplomatic negotiation.

If home markets are desirable and advantageous, as they obviously are, let us retain them for American producers by a tariff admittedly for protection.

If foreign markets are advisable and advantageous, as they clearly and surely are, let us retain them and enlarge them for our American manufacturers by reciprocity treaties.

A tariff for revenue only has proven to be a tariff for insufficient revenue only.

A tariff for judicious protection would prove a tariff for sufficient revenue as well.

If a frank policy of judicious protection intelligently coupled with reciprocity were adopted by the Democratic Party, the business men of America could proceed confidently and competently to take advantage of their present unexampled opportunities.

They would know that those opportunities and advantages would not be temporary, but permanent.

They could build factories, not to operate for the period of a war lasting only a few months, but for periods of years, guaranteed by the fostering care of a wise and farseeing Government.

There would then be no need for continual levies of new taxes.

There would then be no occasion for parades of unemployed or business proceedings in bankruptcy.

There would then be no need of foreign wars or such regrettable calamities to others for us to glean a prosperity which should be naturally our due.

With our home markets secured through legitimate protection and foreign markets obtained through intelligent reciprocity our production would be immense and our prosperity correspondingly great.

Then with a merchant marine to carry our products to all parts of the world and a mighty Navy to protect our ships and our shores America could be in the dominant position which the enterprise and intelligence of its people, if not of its Government, entitle it to hold.

Why can not the Democratic Party abandon its theories, which have proved false, its policies, which have proved fatal?

Why can it not cease forever taxing our producers, forever restricting, restraining, and retarding our production? Why can it not embark upon a new and enlightened policy of intelligently encouraging our production, of adequately transporting our production, and of constantly enlarging and retaining the markets for our production at home and abroad?

In this way lie progress and prosperity for the party, for the Government, and for the Nation.

When the Democratic Party took control of the Government there was a balance in the general fund of the Treasury of nearly \$150,000,000. With the proper administration of the Government that balance would have increased, instead of falling off, as has been the case. The Democrats reduced that balance to \$74,151,000 on May 31, last. It is considerably more than that now, and is quite ample to meet the legitimate needs of the Government until long after the next session of Congress begins, even at the present rate of extravagance. But the Government has \$75,000,000 of this general fund on deposit in national banks at call. If there were any need of additional revenue, that money could be used to much greater advantage than to tax the already overburdened taxpayers. Business has been greatly depressed under the effect of the Democratic tariff law and other legislation, while taxes have been enormously increased. Why add to them at such a time? The answer is that the Underwood tariff law has been a disastrous failure and the Democratic Congress a most extravagant one. The administration foresees the need of additional revenues while that law remains on the statute books. They can not repeal it without admitting the terrible mistake they made in its passage. The law authorizes the President to borrow money on certificates of indebtedness, so far as may be needed, up to \$100,000,000. It has never been the policy of the Government to raise by way of taxation all funds necessary in such a case as that now presented. It would be much better to use that \$75,000,000 deposited in the banks as it might become necessary, as it would almost immediately return to circulation, than to impose additional taxes. It would be better to issue temporary certificates of indebtedness than to impose taxes with the present condition of the country and with the enormous increase in taxation already imposed upon the people. The administration fears naturally that money could not be borrowed at a creditable rate of interest, as was shown under the Cleveland administration. Hence they make a pretext of the war in Europe to impose this further great burden of taxation.

Business was much better in September than in August owing to the increase in exports as the result of the European war. The revenues had been decreasing under the Underwood tariff law for months before the war in Europe was thought of. In July there was a decrease in the revenue of \$4,818,189, as compared with the corresponding month of last year under the protective tariff law. In February there was a decrease of nearly \$10,000,000. There was no talk at that time about a war-revenue measure and no war was even foreshadowed. But in August the total loss of revenue was \$11,503,689. Deducting from that the loss in July the utmost that could be attributed to the war in Europe was \$6,700,000, though in fact not all of that loss was caused by the European disturbance. The difference between the loss in February and the loss in August was only about \$1,500,000, and that is the pretense for bringing in this bill to impose an additional taxation of over \$100,000,000. There is no reasonable excuse for this measure. The President insists that the Government deposits in banks must not be used. But even if this \$75,000,000 were left in the banks, there is no need of taxation when money can be borrowed as provided for by law. Before the next session of Congress there will be no need of any more money than is now in the possession of the Treasury and what will be derived in the ordinary manner. The whole trouble is the extravagance of the party in power and the wretched effect of its

It is well known that appropriations already made by this Congress exceed those of the last Republican Congress by nearly \$100,000,000. Appropriations for pensions decreased \$11,150,000 from last year because of the death of old veterans, and the expenditures for the Panama Canal were very much less because of its practical completion. The sale of two war vessels put \$12,500,000 in the Treasury, and over \$3,000,000 more were credited from the Postal Service this year that really belonged in the receipts of last year. And yet, notwithstanding these "windfalls" and the imposition of the income tax, the condition of the country is such, according to the President, that it was deemed necessary to impose over \$100,000,000 more in taxes. The Senator from Washington illustrated a type of these lavish appropriations when he called attention the other day to the request of the Department of Commerce for an appropriation of \$30,000 to protect life and property in Alaskan waters where the channels need special care. That small appropriation was refused, but \$400,000 was appropriated to secure additional land for the public-building site in Richmond, Va. In the latter case it is a matter of local pride, while in the former case it meant the possible saving of life and property through the improvement of channels by a small appro-



priation not one-thirteenth as great as that made for additional land in Richmond, which could be obtained at some future time as well as now.

The administration asks us to appropriate \$25,000,000 to pay to Colombia as a gift without our receiving any return. Colombia sought to make us pay an unjust sum for the privilege of digging the Panama Canal, and her blackmailing attempt, as Mr. Roosevelt calls it, led to the revolution in Panama, which resulted in our building the canal under much more favorable circumstances. As the canal is open to all the world on the same condition as to the people of the United States, the Democratic Party having shamefully violated their platform—which approved of the law exempting our coastwise vessels from the payment of tolls—by repealing that act, the United States now has no special privilege in the canal, which has cost us in the neighborhood of \$400,000,000. This administration has granted to Colombia, in a treaty which we are asked to ratify, the freedom of the canal for its vessels, while our own must pay tolls. This has been done, notwithstanding the pretext that such a grant was in violation of our treaty with Great Britain, under which plea the law was repealed that granted freedom of tolls to American coastwise vessels. How can we give to Colombia what we have no right under the administration plea to take for ourselves? But not only has the administration agreed to such freedom from tolls for Colombia, but it proposes to make a gift to that country of \$25,000,000, which amount is to be raised by this iniquitous so-called war-revenue measure. Then the Chief Executive has recommended the spending of \$30,000,000 to permit the Government to buy ships to carry on trade with South America, although ships now operating between the United States and ports of South American countries are unable a good part of the time to secure more than half a cargo. The river and harbor bill need not have been passed at this session of Congress, as there was no pressing demand for it. There was a balance of an appropriation for such improvements sufficient to carry on the work until the next session of Congress. Those are some of the kind of appropriations for which this additional tax burden of over \$100,000,000 is asked.

The exports for 10 months under the new tariff, ending with July this year, which was before the war in Europe really began, were \$158,526,289 less than for the corresponding months last year under the Republican tariff law. But the imports for the same time were \$192,323,309 greater. The loss in that time to the people of the United States aggregated \$260,849,598 on the foreign trade alone, to say nothing of the tremendous loss at home caused by the great army of idle workmen and by closed mills and factories, with universal business depression and with a balance of trade against us so that gold exports increased 140 per cent in six months. Commercial failures were \$85,000,000 greater in six months under the new tariff than they were in the corresponding time last year under the Republican tariff law, an increase of 71 per cent. Banking failures increased 60 per cent, railroad earnings decreased 8 per cent in five months, and idle cars increased 212 per cent. That is the condition of things which calls for additional taxation, for which the war in Europe is made a pretext. This country has to pay to Europe about \$500,000,000 annually in interest on bonds, dividends on stock, and so forth. We have been able to meet that situation by the large balance of trade in our favor, which amounted to \$656,897,103 for the months of October, 1912, to and including August, 1913, under the protective tariff law. In the corresponding months under the Democratic tariff law there was a balance of trade in our favor of only \$326,391,262, showing a loss of trade under the Democratic tariff to the extent of \$330,505,841 in 11 months. That tremendous loss was the result of the Democratic tariff legislation. How are we to meet this demand on us from Europe with such an adverse change in the trade situation? The increase in taxation as provided for by the pending measure and the income tax are partial results of the shameful legislation that has brought about that unfortunate condition of affairs.

All Democrats were loud in their demand for publicity in the public business before control of the Government was secured by them. Now secret methods are the rule. Notwithstanding the denunciation of the Republican House because of its rules as to legislation, the record of this Congress has been more czarlike than anything before in the history of this country. Secret methods of levying taxation are illustrated in the preparation of the pending measure. It was prepared by the Democratic members of the committee of the House without allowing their Republican associates to know anything whatever about it. It was put through that branch of Congress under a gag rule that did not permit of a single amendment. Then it was brought here, and the Democratic members of the Committee

on Finance took possession of it, gave secret hearings in some cases, and refused any information to their Republican associates as to what was being done. Could there be anything more different from what the Democrats demanded in the way of publicity than that followed in the preparation of this bill? Like the tariff bill, it is largely a sectional measure. The revenue derived from this bill, as in the case of the income tax, will come largely from the Northern States.

The tax of 20 cents on sweet wines would equal the price of such wines in California, and wines are not used exclusively for drinking purposes. Beer is taxed additionally, but distilled spirits, a large product of the State of Kentucky, is excluded from taxation. It is true that a paltry tax of 5 cents per gallon on rectified whisky was imposed by a Senate amendment. Whisky was protected to a very large extent by the Underwood tariff law, the excise tax in this country being very much less than the duty imposed on foreign whisky. And now whisky virtually escapes from this so-called revenue bill. Why this great favor to the Kentucky product? Probably our energetic free-trade representatives from the State of Kentucky can explain this tender solicitation and protection of their product against this so-called war tax in time of peace, though they are not likely to undertake the task. It might be interesting to inquire why a tax upon rectified spirits and none on distilled spirits was imposed by this Democratic measure. I was suspicious that the same old system of sectional taxation had been agreed to when the smiling countenance of the senior Senator from Kentucky emerged from the Democratic caucus and announced that the opponents of the bill should make no further complaint, as whisky would be taxed and carry a large part of the burden of this bill. In looking at the bill as reported my attention was called to the fact that the tax was upon rectified spirits and none on distilled spirits. I turned to the Government reports to see the quantity of each produced in the United States and where produced. I found there was produced in the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, 185,353,383 gallons of distilled spirits and 108,678,542 gallons of rectified spirits. Strange as it may seem, Kentucky produced 43,308,931 gallons of distilled spirits, or 24 per cent of the production of the United States, and produced but 7,586,458 gallons of rectified spirits, or 7 per cent of the United States production. With a tax of 5 cents per gallon on distilled spirits Kentucky would be compelled to pay \$2,165,446.55, while with the tax of 5 cents per gallon imposed by this bill on rectified spirits Kentucky will pay but \$379,322.80 out of a total tax to be collected of \$5,433,927.10, based on the production for the fiscal year 1913. New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio are the great producers of rectified spirits. Each of these States produce more than Kentucky. No wonder the senior Senator from Kentucky smiled. I might also add that Mississippi produced none for the year 1913.

I received a letter from the Monsanto Chemical Works, of St. Louis, referring to the subject of chloral, for which product they requested a rate of duty at the time the Underwood law was under consideration that would enable them to remain in business as a manufacturer of that product. But such a rate was refused, and as a result they were driven out of that business; and because of the war in Germany the United States now finds it impossible to import chloral, though it is one of the medical products bought for use in the Army. When the importers had driven the St. Louis house out of business, so far as this product was concerned, they put up the price so that the wholesale cost was not less than before competition was destroyed. That illustrates the result with a number of other chemicals, to which I called attention at the time the tariff bill was under consideration. Dyes and other products used by our manufacturers are now cut off because of the war, although the Democrats either abolished the duties or reduced them below the protective point in this country, thus making us wholly dependent upon European countries for these important and necessary products. Coal tar and benzol derived from it are the raw materials for dyes, and we have plenty of that material in this country; but the German Government has in every way helped the manufacturers in that country to build up an enormous trade, even supplying them with coal at what might be called gift prices. Wages are four times as much in this country as in Germany, and the cost of capital is more, while the German patent laws favor the home producer, which is not the case in this country.

The tax on precious stones was doubled by the Underwood law on the pretense that it would increase the revenue. But in nine months the revenue from that source decreased \$373,695, although the duty had been doubled. I told the Senate at the time the Underwood bill was under discussion that this very



thing would happen, and explained that precious stones can be easily smuggled, and doubling the duty encouraged such violation of the law.

A Washington dispatch to the New York Sun on June 15 predicted that the administration would have to authorize a bond issue or ask for tariff revision to raise the necessary revenue to meet the extravagant expenditures of the Government. That statement was based on facts, and has been repeatedly made in Congress. This revenue measure is an outcome of the situation as it existed then, long before the war in Europe began. We have not by any means yet felt the full effects of the shameful Underwood tariff law, nor will we until after the war is over and the warring countries get to producing goods for export. Over three months of the last fiscal year had the benefit of the Republican tariff law, and the duty on wool and woolen goods was maintained for some two months longer. The duty on sugar was not reduced until March, and that duty will not be removed altogether until 1916. The full sugar duty was in effect for eight months of the last fiscal year. When the loss of revenue from sugar takes full effect it can easily be seen what will be the result; in fact, there is even a probability now of another alleged emergency revenue measure at no distant date. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], an old and experienced Democratic Member of Congress, declared not long ago that "no man can tell how long it will be before there will be another emergency that will require an additional levy." The "emergency" in that case simply means the failure of the existing tariff law to produce sufficient funds in addition to those derived from other sources to meet the appropriations made by Congress, and this further "emergency" will require an additional sum to this \$100,000,000 and more than provided for by the existing bill. The Government is the only one not cutting expenses at the present time. Congress has been piling up expenditures to an hitherto unknown amount. The securities of the insurance companies and savings banks shrunk in value to the extent of \$500,000,000 in 18 months, and for that shrinkage Congress and the Democratic Party are responsible.

The effect of the Democratic tariff was not materially felt until April, 1914, as orders could not be placed by American importers and goods made and shipped by the foreign manufacturers much before that date.

I now call attention to the total loss to our commerce by the increased importations and decreased exportations for the months of April, May, June, and July, 1914, the four months preceding the war, as compared with the same months of the year 1913:

Loss for April, \$63,890,849; loss for May, \$63,562,901; loss for June, \$32,812,561; loss for July, \$27,467,352; or a total loss for the four months of \$187,733,633.

What a wonderful difference it would have made to American workmen and to American business if this vast amount of merchandise had been made by the unemployed of our country.

Ninety per cent of the average wholesale cost of manufactured goods, according to the late Abram S. Hewitt, an eminent Democrat and manufacturer, is the labor expended in their production in one form or another. Hence when the goods are made in this country that money goes to workmen and others here. The raw material is valueless until labor makes it useful. For instance, if it is ore, it has to be dug from the ground and transported before it becomes of any use, so that practically 90 per cent of the cost of the article is paid to labor in one form or another. When we import goods we pay that money, or in fact the whole cost of the goods, to the foreign seller and to the transporting company, while when the goods are produced at home their whole cost is retained in this country. Hence the effect of the tariff law in increasing imports and decreasing exports means loss to the American people, distributed among all classes, though the workmen suffer the most. If the ratio of loss for the above four months were to continue for a year, it would mean a loss of \$563,200,989. But the army of idle workmen, thrown out of employment because of the increased imports and decreased exports, means a vast loss to merchants, manufacturers, and the people in general. The condition of the country during this whole year is ample testimony to that unfortunate situation caused by the change in the tariff.

Extravagance in the appropriations is another unfortunate feature of the Democratic control of the Government. Last year there was an increase over the aggregate of the appropriations made by the Republicans, and this year there is a large increase over last year's appropriations. In this connection Mr. President, I ask permission to print in the RECORD a comparison of appropriations for the fiscal years 1913 and 1915, showing an increase for the year 1915, under Democratic control, of \$96,000,066.35, and the end is not yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRYAN in the chair). Without objection permission to do so is granted. The matter referred to is as follows:

*Comparison of appropriations, fiscal years 1913 and 1915.*

Title of bill.	Appropriations, 1913.	Appropriations, 1915.	Increase, 1915 over 1913.	Decrease, 1915 under 1913.
Agricultural.....	\$16,651,496.00	\$19,865,832.00	\$3,214,336.00	
Army.....	90,958,712.98	101,019,212.50	10,060,499.52	
Assistance to people in Europe.....		1,000,000.00		
Diplomatic and Consular.....	3,638,047.41	4,809,856.66	671,809.25	
District of Columbia.....	10,670,733.00	12,172,539.49	1,501,806.49	
Fortifications.....	4,036,235.00	5,627,700.00	1,591,465.00	
Indian.....	8,920,970.66	9,771,902.76	850,932.10	
Legislative.....	34,216,463.38	37,030,229.70	3,413,766.32	
Military Academy.....	1,064,658.26	897,899.54		\$86,768.72
Naval.....	123,225,007.76	144,868,715.61	21,643,708.85	
Pensions.....	166,146,145.84	169,150,000.00	4,003,854.16	
Post Office.....	271,429,599.00	313,364,667.00	41,935,068.00	
Rivers and harbors.....	31,059,370.50	20,000,000.00		
Sundry civil.....	112,039,184.40	110,070,227.39		1,968,957.01
War-risk insurance.....		5,100,000.00		
Deficiencies and miscellaneous.....	13,149,652.60	29,363,586.61	16,213,934.01	
Permanent annual appropriations.....	133,206,424.12	131,196,407.00		2,010,017.12
Total.....	1,019,412,710.91	1,115,508,777.26	105,101,179.70	4,045,742.85

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Utah does that statement include the \$35,000,000 which was appropriated for the Alaskan Railroad?

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that that is not included in the amount given. I can call the Senator's attention to some of the increases if he so desires; but if he will take the time to read the RECORD, he will see just what they are.

Mr. WEST. Mr. President, I will look over the statement in the RECORD.

Mr. SMOOT. Therefore I will not take the time of the Senate to read the figures at this time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I simply wish to suggest to the Senator from Utah that I suppose his statement covers the million dollars which we appropriated for the Alaskan Railroad?

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator refers to the original appropriation?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. But the Senator from Georgia asked me whether the statement included the \$35,000,000 appropriated for the Alaskan Railroad.

Mr. JONES. I thought I would call attention to the fact that it did include the million dollars first appropriated for the Alaskan Railroad.

Mr. SMOOT. I thank the Senator from Washington for calling my attention to that.

The country ought to know that the increase in appropriations of nearly \$100,000,000 would have been enormously increased if it had not been for the determined opposition of the Republican minority. This stupendous amount has been appropriated notwithstanding the Republicans of the Senate led by that splendid man, worthy citizen, and acknowledged statesman, Senator BURTON, of Ohio, forced a cut in the Democratic "pork barrel" river and harbor bill of over \$33,000,000 direct appropriation and prevented the Government from being saddled with a future obligation of \$40,000,000 more, and that the appropriation for the Panama Canal, which is nearly completed, was about \$15,000,000 less than the appropriation for 1913. There is also a decrease in the appropriation for pensions for the fiscal year of 1914, on account of the large number of deaths of our old soldiers, of about \$11,150,000.

In addition to the appropriations already made, there are obligations created by this Congress, either as passed or recommended as administration measures, if reports are true, and for which no appropriation has as yet been made, as follows:

Purchase of ships.....	\$30,000,000
Alaskan Railroad.....	35,000,000
Good roads.....	25,000,000
Colombian treaty.....	25,000,000
Nicaraguan treaty.....	3,000,000
Total.....	118,000,000

Those figures will illustrate how the Democrats have carried out their promise of retrenchment and economy and how idle

were their charges of "profligate extravagance" against the Republicans. We must not forget that direct taxes to the amount of \$71,386,156 were filched from the people during the last fiscal year, consisting of a corporation tax of \$43,079,819 and an income tax of \$28,306,337, and still the administration is demanding \$100,000,000 additional for this fiscal year. The vast decline in railroad revenues and in the income of all great business organizations dealing with the public in general accumulate the proof of the great mistake that was made when the Underwood tariff law was passed.

Chairman FITZGERALD, of the House Committee on Appropriations, declared in that body that—

The Democrats have unnecessarily piled up public expenditure until the Democratic Party is becoming a laughing stock of the country.

Such increase in expenditure and in imports naturally brings about a refutation of many Democratic charges against the Republicans. One of their chief accusations in the campaign of 1912 related to the cost of living, which they promised to reduce materially by the change in the tariff. Everyone knows that the cost of living has increased instead of decreased. According to the New York Times, which is eminent Democratic authority, the cost of 25 food products used by the average family was much higher in July before the European war began than in January. The junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANDELL], who has long been a Member of Congress, declared in this body on September 14:

All kinds of food products are high, higher than usual. The cost of living in this country has constantly increased. The wages of our people have not increased. Most of our laboring men are obliged to support their families on exactly the same wages as formerly, though the prices of food are higher. They are going to suffer more or less.

They have been and are now suffering, not only because of the increased cost of food paid the dealer, but on account of decreased earnings or none at all. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House was very emphatic in his promise, when that bill was under consideration, that it would reduce the cost of living, but the Senator from Louisiana, an equally eminent Democrat, shows how false that promise was. It was like the promise of simplicity so often made and so freely discounted. As the junior Senator from Iowa stated in this body not long ago—

You can hardly go along the streets without being run over by a Government automobile in which is riding the wife of a Government officer, or somebody else, at Government expense, to make calls.

That illustrates the promised simplicity. The senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], who is one of the most radical free traders of this body, in a speech he delivered in Texas some years ago, criticized the Democratic Party in the following words:

The trouble with the Democratic Party is it is a party of statesmen without statesmanship, patriots without patriotism, heroes without heroism. Their policy begets farmers without farming, laborers without labor, freemen without freedom. \* \* \* The Fifty-second Congress had a Democratic majority of a hundred and forty-eight; and if it redeemed a single pledge, absorbed a single promise, kept a single command, or discharged a single obligation made to the people of the United States, I will quit the stump and retire from the canvass. In the matter of economy that Congress exceeded the Republican \$1,000,000,000 Congress by \$40,000,000.

The latter part of the quotation in part will apply to the existing Congress, of which the eminent Senator from Oklahoma is a Member. But the excess appropriations made by this Congress over those made by the last Republican Congress are much greater than those mentioned by the Senator from Oklahoma in that speech. The eminent Secretary of State, three times a Democratic candidate for President, declared last year that—

The representative who secures office on a platform pledge and then betrays the people who elected him is a criminal worse than he who embezzles money.

It would be interesting to know what the Secretary would do in the way of punishment to his party, who are now in control of the Government, and who promised to reduce the cost of living, but have increased it, and who promised to extend our foreign trade, increase employment for our workmen, and do many other things which they have absolutely failed to do. They secured office on such a platform and have betrayed the people.

This session of Congress has not yet ended, and if the eminent chairman of the Committee on Rules of the House has his way—and we have just received notice from an eminent Democrat of the Senate to a similar effect—it will not end until provision has been made for the benefit of the cotton growers of the South, so that the Government will guarantee them against loss. He wants the Government to deposit \$250,000,000 in National and State banks in the cotton States, to be advanced to the producers of cotton or the owners of land on which the same is produced at a rate of interest not to exceed 3 per cent per annum.

Mr. President, I am in sympathy with the conditions existing in the South, as I am with the conditions existing all over the United States. In my own State our copper industry is languishing. Not half of the usual number of men are employed in that industry in the West, and the operators are trying to divide up the time of employment between the men who have families depending upon them, hoping conditions will right themselves in the very near future. The cotton producers are entitled to sympathy, and so are the farmers of the North and all other producers. Why should we make a discrimination in favor of one section of the country over another? But "the South is in the saddle," according to Mr. C. S. Barrett, of Union City, Ga., president of the National Farmers' Union, who, at a joint conference held at Fort Worth, Tex., on August 31, said:

The United States must buy three or four million bales of cotton at not less than 10 cents a pound from the farmers of the South. Three or four hundred millions of dollars is all that will be required. The South is in the saddle at Washington, and can do whatever it wants to do. The boys at Washington will do whatever you tell them to do if you give them to understand that you mean business.

Some such idea seems to have prevailed in forming the new tariff. Almonds, dates, figs, filbert nuts, garlic, lemons, oranges, pecans, peanut oil, pepper, pineapples, peanuts, rice, and other southern products were carefully protected. But the farm products of the North were put on the free list or duties reduced below the protective point. Hence we have had imports of corn, potatoes, barley, oats, wheat, eggs, dairy products, and so forth, to a great extent, while prices have not been reduced in the least to consumers. We have had an increase in the imports of cattle in 11 months to the extent of \$11,968,347; corn, \$9,775,179; oats, \$7,984,053; meat and dairy products, \$30,453,388; vegetables, \$4,791,525; wool, unmanufactured, \$30,136,171; wool, manufactured, \$22,596,828; and wheat, \$1,473,040; and I might continue. Nearly all of those products are furnished in great plenty in the United States, but our farmers were deprived of the home markets to a very large extent for the benefit of the foreigners, and certain trusts in this country, without a particle of benefit to American consumers.

Mr. President, I have prepared a table showing the imports entered for consumption in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, of the following articles: Cattle, oats, wheat, fresh beef, lumber, sugar, and wool. This table shows the rate of duty under the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill, and also under the Payne-Aldrich bill. It shows the quantity imported; it shows the value; and it shows the duty collected. I have also prepared a column showing the loss to the United States on these imported articles under the rates of the Underwood-Simmons bill applied, instead of the rates of the Payne-Aldrich bill. I want to say that there has been a loss upon this basis to the Government of the United States on cattle of \$4,524,566.25; on oats, \$1,933,449.70; on wheat, \$154,396.52; on fresh beef, \$2,579,178.80; on lumber, \$1,238,811.11; on sugar, \$7,509,226.11; on unmanufactured wool, \$26,027,862.91; on manufactures of wool, \$12,562,788.24; or on these eight items alone a loss to the United States of \$56,530,279.64; and no one dare say that the American consumer has received one cent of benefit.

I ask permission to have this table printed in the Record. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEPARD in the chair). In the absence of objection, permission is granted.

(The table referred to is printed on following page.)

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the American Sheep Breeder, a publication of Chicago, Ill., addressed certain letters to the principal clothing manufacturers of the United States, also to the wholesalers of clothing and to the retailers, asking them if woollen goods—clothing, if you please—had decreased or increased in price since the passage of the Underwood tariff law. I have a copy of those letters in the way of answer, and I want to say to the Senate and to the country that universally they say there has been no reduction. I might refer to the answer made by Hart, Schaffner & Marx, the largest clothing manufacturers in all the world, who state that there has been a slight increase.

Mr. President, with those facts staring us in the face, we must admit we have a fiscal policy now in force in this country that has lost to the American Treasury, upon wool and manufactures of wool alone, \$38,500,000, and the American consumer has received no benefit.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And with no corresponding benefit to anyone.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, 80 per cent of the articles in value put on the free list were agricultural articles. Eight months' increase of imports of manufactured products showed an increase of about 9 per cent, but agricultural products showed an increase of 149 per cent.



Imports entered for consumption in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1914.

Articles.	Quantity.	Rate of duty.	Value.	Duty.	Loss if Payne rates had been in force.
<b>Cattle:</b>					
For breeding and teams of immigrants.....number.....	540	Free <sup>1</sup> .....	\$76,521.00		
Other.....do.....	134,991	Average ad valorem, 26.75 per cent <sup>1</sup> .....	2,125,952.58	\$468,686.77	\$4,524,536.25
Cattle.....do.....	736,862	Free <sup>2</sup> .....	16,540,434.58		
Oats, grain.....bushels.....	7,460.25	15 cents per bushel <sup>1</sup> .....	3,103.84	1,119.08	1,933,449.70
Wheat, grain.....do.....	21,482,774.46	6 cents per bushel <sup>1</sup> .....	7,600,254.43	1,288,966.47	
	7,505.23	25 cents per bushel <sup>1</sup> .....	5,843.50	1,876.27	
	736	Free <sup>2</sup> .....	774.00		154,396.62
Beef, fresh.....pounds.....	1,029,310.13	10 cents per bushel <sup>2</sup> .....	899,413.56	102,931.00	
Beef, fresh (for supplies of vessels).....do.....	3,634,094	15 cents per pound <sup>1</sup> .....	270,467.00	54,496.46	
	171,945,267	Free <sup>2</sup> .....	14,762,866.44		2,579,178.80
	161,794	Free, sec. 21 <sup>1</sup> .....	11,631.00		
Lumber.....		Free <sup>1</sup> .....	78,654.00		
		Average ad valorem, 8 per cent <sup>1</sup> .....	6,495,887.89	519,979.18	1,238,811.11
		Free <sup>2</sup> .....	15,587,737.02		
Sugar.....pounds.....	2,728,801,607	Average ad valorem, 9.96 per cent <sup>2</sup> .....	418,404.70	41,696.22	
Sugar (for manufacture in bonded warehouse and export).....	2,563,121,246	Average ad valorem, 65.08 per cent <sup>2</sup> .....	55,606,364.99	36,190,829.03	
Sugar (for use of the United States).....	38,139	Average ad valorem, 30.19 per cent <sup>2</sup> .....	50,441,375.45	25,318,021.03	\$7,509,226.11
Sugar (from Philippine Islands).....	125	Free, Sec. IV, and sec. 23.....	2,796.00		
Wool, etc., and manufactures of:	113,457,155	Free.....	10.00		
Unmanufactured.....pounds.....	33,400,682.50	Average ad valorem, 41.36 per cent <sup>2</sup> .....	5,935,635.00	2,451,882.87	
	291,183,066.61	Free <sup>1</sup> .....	62,431,087.14		26,027,862.91
	2,837,041	Average ad valorem, 15 per cent <sup>1</sup> .....	916,681.00	137,352.15	
Manufactures of.....		Average ad valorem, 80.41 per cent <sup>2</sup> .....	7,394,218.70	5,945,670.81	
Manufactures of (for construction and equipment of vessels).....		Free <sup>2</sup> .....	1,112,520.00		12,562,788.24
Manufactures of (for use of foreign ministers).....		Average ad valorem, 33.75 per cent <sup>10</sup> .....	25,008,003.34	8,440,724.57	
		Free, Sec. IV, J 5.....	1,857.00		
		Free, art. 636, Cus. Reg.....	783.00		
Total loss.....					56,530,279.64

<sup>1</sup> From July 1 to Oct. 3, 1913.<sup>2</sup> From Oct. 4, 1913, to June 30, 1914.<sup>3</sup> From July 1, 1913, to Feb. 28, 1914.<sup>4</sup> From Mar. 1 to June 30, 1914.<sup>5</sup> Loss Mar. 1 to June 30.<sup>6</sup> From July 1, 1913, to Nov. 30, 1913.<sup>7</sup> From Dec. 1, 1913, to June 30, 1914.<sup>8</sup> From July 1 to Dec. 31, 1913.<sup>9</sup> From Dec. 1, 1913, to June 30, 1914.<sup>10</sup> From Jan. 1 to June 30, 1914.

The Agricultural Department gave as one reason for the increase in value of meat animals on farms the increased cost of production. It is somewhat amusing for the Secretary of Agriculture to assert that it costs more under the Democratic tariff to produce things on a farm than it did under the Republican tariff, but we will take his word for it. The Bureau of Labor Statistics, in a bulletin issued a considerable time before the war in Europe began, gave prices of 15 common articles of food in 40 important industrial cities, showing that 13 articles had advanced in price and only 2 declined. That is the way the Democratic tariff law reduced the cost of living after they asserted the tariff was the cause of high prices. The Government lost in revenue in eight months of the new tariff \$12,414,133 because of putting cattle, beef, veal, prepared meats, sheep, mutton and lamb, and corn and oats on the free list. The Beef Trust and the Corn Products Co. may have benefited by that legislation, but the consumer did not. We know that the Corn Products Co. profited, because its president has stated in a letter over his own signature that the corn imported from Argentina enabled them to buy it much cheaper than they would have had to pay for corn grown in this country. But no one can point to the reduction in the prices of the articles made out of that corn by this well-known trust.

The senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] showed himself a prophet at the very beginning of this administration when he said:

The Biblical quotation I used a few days ago will become historical: "The wild asses of the desert, thirsty and hungry, have broken into the green corn." That applies all along the line, from top to bottom. The Democrats have been out in the cold so long \* \* \* that they are simply wild.

Mr. President, the party has created many thousands of new places which it controls in nearly all cases, free from civil-service regulations, as well as the old places, and of course that costs money. Col. George Harvey, editor of the North American Review and a distinguished Democrat, who was called to the city recently in order that the President might confer with him, emphasizes the economy of this administration in these words:

I would direct attention to the fact that only the other day the Secretary of State appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations and announced with pardonable pride that, while he had been conducting the affairs of his department with all the fire and dash of an anglerworm, he had reduced the estimated expenditures of his department so as to make a net saving of \$120 per annum. By a simple method of dropping a clerk, who had been drawing \$900 a year, he was enabled to employ a footman, and added somewhat pathetically, "You gentlemen of course know that you can not get along with a driver alone when engaged in the matter of returning cards." The Senators granted the allowance. So, too, finally did the House, though there was objection to the appropriation for "a footman" and also to the appropriation for equipment for drivers, which it was insisted meant livery, and nothing else. Nevertheless, since nobody seemed to know what is considered a suitable costume for a footman, where footmen

are unheard of, and the only cards known are euchre decks, the protest passed unheeded, and the appropriation was made with one condition, that "equipment" should not comprise "skin-tight pants," thus completely demolishing the theory of the peacham philosopher that "it is not the coat that makes the man, it's the pants."

Mr. President, much more of a similar nature might be quoted from Mr. Harvey, and the fact that he was invited recently to the White House would seem to imply that the President recognizes the force of what Mr. Harvey has had to say about the administration.

For the first 23 days in September the loss of revenue was only \$1,730,446. From July 1 to September 23 there was an increase in revenue over last year, but disbursements were nearly \$8,000,000 greater. The trouble with the administration is that they need economy in practice and not in words only. If reliance were made on the issue of bonds to meet any possible need in the way of revenue, the issue would only have to be large enough to meet the absolute necessity, but by this method of additional taxation the money is taken from the people whether or not needed. In other words, the administration has put money in the banks, and will keep it there so that the banks can loan it to the people to pay their taxes with.

This demand for taxation is on a psychological basis; in other words, it is on an imaginary basis; but the money is to be used for a definite purpose, and that is to make up the deficit caused by the disastrous legislation put through by the party in power.

If the Republican Party regains control of Congress, or of either branch of it, we will stop this useless extravagance and this dangerous legislation threatening business men with its disastrous effect. There will be no need of increased taxation with Republican control in either branch of Congress, and when the Republicans again come in control of the entire Government there will be a resumption of the prosperous times that prevailed when we were in control before and a decrease in taxation. There will be work for all. We will stop this increase in the importation of articles that can better be made in this country. The mills will start up, labor will be employed, confidence will be restored, and this unceasing assault on business, which has been carried on for months in Congress, will come to an end. Idle workmen will not ask for bread and in answer be given greater burdens to bear in the way of taxation.

There would be no trouble with business to-day excepting for the Democratic assaults on it in various directions. We could establish the industries, such as the manufacture of dyes and dyestuffs and various other things which we now rely on Europe for, if we only gave such protection as was given in Europe in the past.

You now propose by this bill to tax conveyances, contracts, leases, etc., most of which taxes will fall on the comparatively

poor. You tax the merchandise broker under this bill four times, as follows:

First. Tax of \$20 for doing business.

Second. Ten-cent stamps on each and every contract, which is, in a great number of cases, for very small quantities, as the article dealt in is frequently purchased by the jobber every day on which the commission is very slight, amounting frequently to less than \$1.

Third. A tax on telegrams.

Fourth. A tax on telephone messages. There are other provisions in this bill just as absurd as the latter, to which I shall call attention when we reach the bill for consideration by paragraphs. There will be more of this taxation if the Democratic Party remains in control of the Government. The income-tax receipts were only about one-half the sum that was estimated, and those receipts were on the business of 1913. When the tax comes to be assessed on the business of this year it will be a very different story, and that is one reason why the administration wants this \$100,000,000 and more of taxation.

Mr. President, we have imported more from Canada and sold her much less under the existing law than was the case under the protective tariff. In imposing new rates to raise war revenue—and Canada is actually engaged in the war—she has imposed rates that will still further hurt many of our products. Turkey has repudiated her treaties and is increasing her tariff rates, which will affect our trade with that country to some extent. We all know how Japan has taken away our cotton trade in Manchuria and excluded many of our products from Japan by increased tariff rates. She is also becoming a great competitor with us even in our home markets, in many lines of trade. China wants to increase her tariff rates. The tendency the world over is to increase tariff rates on products that can be made at home, instead of decreasing them. It is only the Democratic Party, with its Bourbon teachings and traditions, that kills home industries by opening the markets of the country to foreign products made with cheap labor and under conditions which the workmen of our country can not compete with.

There is no end to the wild policies which the Democratic Party has put forth since it came into power. It made a great outcry against the rules of the House when the Republicans were in control. But we never had such a dominion of gag rule as we have had under Democratic control. All important legislation has been brought out of secret caucuses and put through the House under gag rule that would not even, as in the case of this so-called war emergency revenue measure, permit of a single amendment. The promotion of American interests by the Panama Canal, so far as our merchant marine is concerned, has been wantonly destroyed without a shadow of sound reason.

The importance of rural credits for the benefit of the agricultural interests of the country was another subject the Democrats advocated, and the President only last December spoke of such legislation as an "urgent necessity." The subject was considered and a bill reported, but no action taken. Good roads was another one of their platform promises, and after a continuous session of 18 months nothing has been done to carry out that promise. The workmen generally demanded improved immigration laws to keep out undesirable aliens; but the bill has been shelved in this body, although the workmen's organization asserts that 73 Senators have written favorable letters in regard to such legislation.

There has been no legislation in regard to the transportation of convict-made goods. Nothing has been done in the way of a compensation act for workmen, though such legislation was promised.

Contrast that record with the legislation of the Republicans. We gave the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to fix rates on railroads in the interest of the public. We passed the postal savings bank law, one providing for the parcel post. We initiated legislation that enabled the income tax to be imposed, though we intended such a law only for use under extraordinary circumstances and for a limited time only. We did not anticipate relieving foreigners of taxation, as the Democrats have done, and then imposing the burden of an income tax upon our own people. The Department of Labor was created under a Republican administration, and also the Bureau of Mines and the Children's Bureau, while the white-slave act, another Republican measure, has proved of great benefit. A workmen's compensation law was defeated by a Democratic filibuster, and they have prevented any such legislation since they came into control of the Government. That is the record, and I have mentioned only a few of the important measures that the Republican Party can well be proud of.

The Democrats promised a wise, systematic, and comprehensive system of river and harbor improvements. Beyond a

vast increase in appropriations for that purpose and a more reckless method of making them the party has done nothing. Like so many other of its promises, they have been repudiated. They promised to increase the merchant marine. One step they took in that direction was to repeal the law that would allow our coastwise merchant vessels the free use of the Panama Canal. They have put our ships at a disadvantage with those of foreign nations, which have their tolls paid by their respective Governments or which receive large subsidies. The Democrats promised to uphold civil-service reform and strengthen the laws in that respect. They have taken the opposite course whenever they have had opportunity. They promised to decrease the number of officeholders, while they have increased it many thousands. Deputy marshals, income-tax collectors, commercial attachés, and many others are now entirely outside of the civil-service regulations, and a great effort has been made to exempt all post-office employees and utterly demoralize that service by returning it to the spoils system. There is scarcely a department that has not made inroads in the way of demanding more money and more places. The Democrats promised to reduce the number of places in the Treasury Department, whereas they have increased them to the extent of 933, whose salaries will cost the Government over \$1,750,000.

Five new offices, with salaries of \$12,000 each, were created by the banking law, and at the same time the salary of the Comptroller of the Currency was increased from \$5,000 to \$12,000. Five commissioners at \$10,000 each and a secretary at \$5,000 were created by the Trade Commission act. A new board of appeals, consisting of three members, with a salary of \$4,000 each, has been created in the office of the Secretary of the Interior. Our diplomatic representatives to Argentina, Chile, and Spain have had their salaries raised from \$12,000 to \$17,500 each per annum. The assistant to the Attorney General received an increase of salary from \$7,000 to \$9,000. The salaries of six Assistant Attorneys General in the Department of Justice are raised from \$5,000 to \$7,500. The private secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury received an increase of salary from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and you can depend upon it that the private secretaries of the other nine Cabinet officers will be increased.

The sum of \$100,000 was appropriated for commercial attachés to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, and a clerk to each attaché is allowed. The mission to Paraguay and Uruguay is divided, and a new minister authorized with a salary of \$10,000. Five special examiners, at \$1,300 each, who are not under the civil service, but are political appointments, are provided for. Mr. President, I could continue along this same line for hours, but why continue; the aggregate amount of appropriations tell the story.

But the Government clerks, who have not had their pay increased in half a century, have in many cases been demoted or dismissed altogether to enable partisans to receive larger salaries without regard to their merits.

A law was passed in this Congress to permit foreign vessels to be registered as American ships, and the provision was made that, if necessary, the President might suspend the law requiring the watch officers to be American citizens. He did not wait for any necessity to act, but promptly suspended the law for seven years, although there are said to be hundreds of Americans qualified to act, who are now without employment. Such a suspension of the law requiring American officers for so long a period is without a shadow of excuse.

Mr. JONES. If the Senator will allow me, I will state in this connection that it was known to the department before the suspension was made that some five or six hundred American officers on the Pacific coast were available for this service.

Mr. SMOOT. I thank the Senator. It is simply a part of the policy of the Democratic Party to compel Americans to accept the low wages, or salaries, paid to Asiatic and European workmen and officers. If American workmen want that policy continued, they will vote to keep the Democratic Party in power.

It is a little singular that the Democrats should have brought in this bill enormously to increase taxation, when there is no war in which the United States is engaged, nor any likelihood of this country becoming involved in such an unfortunate situation. But when we did have a war, in 1898, and a necessary bill was brought in to increase the revenues, the Democratic Party fought it with all the power at its command. The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, who was chiefly instrumental in drawing up this bill for the consideration of that body, declared that he had copied after the Republican bill of 1898. But in that year he attacked the bill viciously, and declared that it did not allow the wealth of the Nation its share of the taxes, though he now admits that he copied that same act. He complained of the increased tax on



beer, and yet this bill adds 75 per cent. He complained that the Republican bill increased the taxes on tobacco, and yet that is one of the things they have done in this bill, and he said:

This tax will fall almost entirely on the hard-working and industrious artisans, merchants, mechanics, farmers, and professional men of the country, but not on idle wealth.

It would be interesting to know what excuse he could make now for copying that act, which he so denounced at that time. But that is the way of the Democratic Party. It has no regard for its platform, and no thought of its record on public questions in the past. It is a party of contradictions and of reckless blunders, costly to the country, and this measure is one of the worst of its many blunders committed at this session of Congress.

#### ALASKA COAL LANDS.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], one of the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, has left the city to return no more during this session, I understand. I ask that he be relieved from further duty upon the conference committee in charge of that bill, and that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON] be appointed a conferee in his place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAMDEN in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. SMOOT. My attention was diverted and I did not hear the request of the Senator from Montana. Will he repeat it?

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH], one of the conferees on the part of the Senate on the Alaska coal-land leasing bill, having left the city, as I understand, to return no more this session, I asked that he be relieved from further service. The next Senator in line for service on the conference committee would be the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS]. I spoke to him about it, and he told me that he is too busy with other matters to serve. The next is the Senator from Kansas [Mr. THOMPSON], and I ask that he be appointed in lieu of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### EMERGENCY REVENUE LEGISLATION.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18891) to increase the internal revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Johnson	Oliver	Thomas
Bankhead	Jones	Overman	Thornton
Camden	Kern	Page	Townsend
Chilton	Lane	Perkins	Warren
Clark, Wyo.	Lea, Tenn.	Poinexter	Weeks
Coff	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	West
Culberson	Lewis	Sheppard	White
Gronna	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Hitchcock	McLean	Smith, Ga.	
Hollis	Myers	Smoot	
James	Norris	Swanson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEST in the chair). Forty-one Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of absent Senators, and Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. TILLMAN answered to their names when called.

Mr. BRISTOW, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. STONE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I gave notice this morning that at the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] I should make a request for unanimous consent to vote upon this bill on Thursday next. I now think it would be better to postpone making that request, with a view to seeing whether or not we can not come to some agreement. I think to make the request now would result merely in a waste of time, and I shall not, therefore, carry out the purpose I then expressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the bill for the purpose of amendment.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire, first, to make some general remarks on this bill, and then to take up some specific items before the bill is read.

I am firmly of the opinion that what is needed at this time is not more taxes but more economy. If there was any one thing which inspired confidence among the people in the Democratic Party it was the promise that they would establish greater economy in our national affairs. It was proclaimed from the stump that the Republican administration had been prodigal in expenditures; and in repeated platforms of the Democratic Party they declared that if they were intrusted with power they would inaugurate an era of frugality. But what do we witness?

The first session of the present Congress, in which appropriations were made, witnessed a larger total than at any time in the history of our Government, unless perhaps during the last year of the Civil War, when vast armies were being maintained in the field and conditions were most exceptional. We have here the contrast between promise and performance. It is so easy for a political organization which seeks power to make promises, but so much more difficult to perform them when the people, relying on those promises, have intrusted power to them. Without any spirit of partisanship, I give due credit to that period of economy which prevailed after the election of the Democratic House of Representatives in 1874. In the prior Congresses there had been some tendency toward decreasing expenditures, but under the control and direction of Mr. Randall, in the first year for which that Congress made appropriations, there was a marked decrease in our national disbursements. The total expenditures, exclusive of those required for the Post Office Department, fell to \$238,000,000 for the fiscal year 1877, \$20,000,000 less than for the preceding year. That, Mr. President, was a record of which to be proud; but what has the present Congress to show in comparison with it? Not only are the appropriations the largest ever made, but they were so before we disposed of the river and harbor bill, that would have carried some \$43,000,000 in cash, together with \$10,000,000 in authorizations and a committal to nearly \$40,000,000 more, if it had been adopted in the form in which it was recommended here in the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not think the people will be unmindful of the contrast between the promises made and the record written by this Democratic Congress.

The one fault I have to find with the specific items of this bill is that there is a maximum of annoyance in comparison with a minimum of revenue. By restoring the duty on sugar, \$10,000,000 of revenue additional could have been obtained; and I question whether it would not have been best to impose the taxes upon objects which are already subject to taxation, especially in view of the fact that by the express terms of the bill its operation is to terminate on the 31st day of December, 1915. That is the form in which it is recommended to the Senate, although many will apprehend that when December 31, 1915, shall have arrived the same expanding appropriations which have marked this Congress will be so in evidence that these taxes must be made permanent.

This bill provides for the taxation of so great a variety of articles as to make it exceedingly vexatious. I will read here a few selected telegrams which I have received in regard to this proposed revenue bill:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 7, 1914.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The receivers of Central Union Telephone Co., operating 117,000 telephone stations with a system of connecting toll lines in 72 counties of Ohio, protest against proposed tax of 1 cent on each telephone toll message on which the toll charge is 15 cents or over. This is a tax of 7 per cent on a 15-cent message, 5 per cent on a 20-cent message, 4 per cent on a 25-cent message, and so on. Such a tax would place a serious burden on 15 and 20 cent messages, and, if a tax is to be imposed, the minimum toll subject to tax should be not less than 25 cents and the period allowed for payment should not be less than 30 days.

E. A. REED,

General Manager for Receivers.

The bill as amended by the Senate committee gives the additional 30 days' time, so the complaint in the latter portion of the telegram is not now applicable. But, Mr. President, this tax of 7 per cent on the cheaper messages, which should certainly receive as careful consideration by the Senate as any, is a most burdensome imposition. It may be thought that it will fall on the telephone companies—this telephone company, by the way, is in the hands of a receiver, and does not seem to be making any very great profit—but it is sure to be reflected either in diminished service or in some other form, so that it will operate to the disadvantage of the public.

I insist that on the cheaper messages, at least, the tax is too burdensome. Why should this Government, which has so many sources for obtaining revenue, go into the business of levying a cent on every telephone message? It seems to me absurd.

The mere matter of bookkeeping imposes a burden on the managers of the telephone companies, and indirectly it is a burden on the revenue officers altogether out of keeping with the amount to be derived from the tax.

The next telegram which I desire to read is one which I conjecture has been received by other Members of the Senate, and is from the president of the Chicago Board of Trade:

CHICAGO, ILL., October 8, 1914.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We would respectfully call your attention to a fact which we think is not understood by our Senators and Representatives. This is that the effect of that part of the revenue bill on page 22, lines 18 to 23, will be to impose a tax on every bale of cotton and on every bushel of grain shipped from any country point to be sold in the principal markets of the country, on any chamber of commerce, board of trade, or similar place. It is a direct tax on sales of both cotton and grain, whether for domestic consumption or export. We believe that all the State grain dealers' associations and producers who are aware of this section are in favor of its elimination. We do not believe the Congress desires to impose a tax on cotton and foodstuffs.

C. H. CANBY,

President of Board of Trade of the City of Chicago.

I have another telegram on this same subject from a commission firm in the city of Cincinnati, as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, October 9, 1914.

Senator T. E. BURTON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate the elimination of that section of the revenue bill, page 22, lines 18 to 23, taxing every bushel of grain shipped to any of the leading terminal markets for sale on grain exchanges of this country, as do not believe the people of this country favor a tax on foodstuffs and cotton.

ROBERTS, HALL & CRISS,

Again, I have a telegram from the Ohio Shippers' Association, dated Columbus, Ohio, October 9:

COLUMBUS, OHIO, October 9, 1914.

Hon. THEODORE BURTON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Supplementing our former mail and telegraphic communications to you we again protest on behalf of our membership against the provisions of H. R. 18891, imposing a stamp tax on bills of lading or other evidence of receipt and forwarding of shipments of all classes; also the proposed tax on sales of grain, either for present or future delivery, which would impose an additional, unjust, and unreasonable burden on the producer and consumer of the chief necessity of life.

OHIO GRAIN DEALERS' ASSOCIATION,  
OHIO SHIPPERS' ASSOCIATION,  
J. W. MCCORD, Secretary.

I have a letter from a firm in Toledo which goes more fully into detail. It is as follows:

TOLEDO, OHIO, October 8, 1914.

Hon. Senator T. E. BURTON,  
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We notice the Senate bill for tax on all sales of grain on exchanges of 1 per cent. This tax means 60 cents on 5,000 bushels of wheat, 25 cents on 5,000 bushels of oats at present price, and 35 cents on 5,000 bushels of corn. Taxing a legitimate business out of all precedent—

This letter was written before the bill was in its final shape, and the writer labored under a misapprehension as to some of its provisions—

together with the tax on checks, etc., which sometimes amounts to \$2 or \$3 per day, makes a heavy penalty upon the trade that moves the great business of the country. Supposing, for instance, the grain exchanges had closed, the same as the stock exchanges, what would have happened? There wouldn't have been a grease spot left of any of the banks in the country. You would have had a panic that would have swept everything before it, together with the war conditions. They didn't ask the Government to carry their trades or to issue warehouse receipts, etc., but they pluckily stood and started to move the crop, equal in value to one billion in wheat, one billion or more in corn, and five or six hundred millions in oats. They have met their obligations, and are moving the stuff abroad despite the obstacles they have before them in trying to export, and are relieving the country by furnishing bills of exchange in place of gold. These are facts that can not be disputed and we are willing to pay our share of any reasonable tax, although we think the war tax is unnecessary at the present time, when we are at peace. In addition to this, we are obliged to pay a brokerage tax, which, seemingly, is an oppressive burden upon one single branch of business.

Trusting this tax can be obliterated, and that you can see your way clear to work against same, we remain,

Yours, truly,

W. H. MOREHOUSE & CO.

Before passing from the matter of the tax on sales of grain, I will say that the amount of revenue that could be realized from it is trivial in comparison with the inconvenience to which the dealers will be subjected and the burden which it imposes upon the farmers of the country, the producers of grain and of cotton. Indeed, I can hardly think of a place where a tax could be imposed which seems more vexatious and irrational than this. I can with perfect consistency criticize any provisions derived from the act of 1898, because I tried at that time to point out that the articles taxed were too varied and too numerous, and that it imposed an immediate burden on too large a number of people.

I have received numerous letters from druggists and others protesting against the tax on proprietary medicines, one of which I quote as follows:

CINCINNATI, OHIO, October 8, 1914.

Senator THEODORE E. BURTON,  
The Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association in special convention assembled at Columbus, Ohio, does most strenuously object to proposed taxing of proprietary medicines which in many instances are necessities. Similar tax was placed on proprietary medicines during the Spanish-American War, which resulted in the manufacturers increasing the cost of same to the retail druggists by 6 per cent. This proposed tax would again increase the cost on proprietary medicines and add to the burden already borne by the druggist through the increased cost of all drugs, caused by the war. On account of conditions under which these proprietors are listed there is no chance for the consumers to share this tax.

THEO. D. WETTERSTROME,  
Secretary O. S. P. A., 2,000 Members.

Mr. BRISTOW, Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to inquire of the Senator if he knows why this bill has been styled the "war-revenue bill"?

Mr. BURTON. Certainly, the occasion for it arose not so much from the war as from the swollen appropriations of the Democratic Congress and the disappointing results of the Underwood tariff. I suppose the term is given it because it is contemporaneous with the war in Europe and perhaps is by way of imitation of the act of 1898.

Mr. BRISTOW. But in 1898 we were engaged in a war that was calling upon us for increased expenditures for war purposes.

Mr. BURTON. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. And we then passed a war-tax bill. Now, however, we are at peace with all the world, and, in fact, we are profiting to a certain extent by the war in some lines.

Mr. BURTON. In some lines of production.

Mr. BRISTOW. Because Europe is engaged in a war, why should we, in passing a revenue tax to make up a deficit in our Treasury caused by things entirely foreign to the war, style it a war tax?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I certainly can see no justification for it, and no adequate reason for the imposition of any such tax. Before this war commenced, before the declaration of war, before the ultimatum to Serbia, before the assassination of the Austrian crown prince, conditions of depression arose which have caused economy in almost every home. At such a time, instead of breaking records on appropriations, Congress should recognize the situation and adopt something of the same economy which the circumstances have forced the people to adopt in their homes.

I have here a letter in regard to chewing gum. This article seems to have been a sort of football in the way of taxation, judging from the duty imposed on the raw material in the first place. People have been prone to ridicule it as a form of luxury not altogether to be commended. At the same time a very strong showing is made by the manufacturers. I read this letter:

CHICAGO, October 7, 1914.

Hon. THEODORE E. BURTON,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The proposed stamp tax of 4 cents per box on chewing gum we believe to be absolutely unfair, unjust, and class legislation. Why single out one confection from all the others, such as candy, chocolates, bonbons, etc., which are our competitors, especially when one of our principal raw materials, chicla, now pays over 66 per cent duty? Said duty was increased, as you know, 100 per cent in the Underwood tariff bill passed last fall. We will also have to pay our portion of the other taxes assessed.

We respectfully submit this protest.  
Very truly, yours,

WM. WRIGHT, Jr., Co.,  
A. G. Cox, Vice President.

In view of the fact that they pay a 66 per cent duty on their raw material—I do not at this minute recall whether it is an ad valorem or a specific duty, but I take it this figure is correctly given—it is not fair to impose on them this discriminatory tax when similar articles are allowed to go free.

If there were time, I should discuss the tendency of all taxation to diffuse itself. It was taken as an axiom by Adam Smith and many of the older economists, including the President of the French Republic, M. Thiers, that all taxation, in its ultimate burden, rested upon consumption or upon expenditure. The later theories on that subject do not, however, sustain this theory as an absolute rule. It was maintained, for instance, that if a tax was placed upon houses, and the rental previously was a certain figure—say, \$20 per apartment or house per month—and a tax of \$2 per month was imposed upon it, the



owner immediately raised the rental to \$22, and the one who incurred the expenditure for rent, the occupant of the house, must pay that tax. It was said that otherwise building enterprise would cease or improvements would be allowed to run down, so that the value of the property for renting purposes would be recouped from the tenant; that is, he would have a less valuable house for his \$20, or he would pay an extra \$2 for the house. With regard to the taxation of mortgages, this same general rule prevails, though it does not apply to all forms of taxation.

I do not desire to go into that question at this time, but I want to call attention to one thing, namely, the tendency of taxation in most forms to diffuse itself. In that, it seems to me, the old economists were right. This, however, is claimed to be merely a temporary tax, and it will be impossible to adjust it in one year so that it will fall fairly on anybody. At least, with this multitude of items here, such, for instance, as taxes on different kinds of insurance policies, there can be no fair, no equitable adjustment of the burdens of a temporary tax of this nature.

My objections, then, go to the necessity for this tax; to the neglect of the proper method to cure the situation, namely, by greater economy; to the varied classes of taxation provided in this bill, making it exceptionally vexatious; and to the onerous provisions which punctuate its pages. I also call attention to the fact that, in view of its temporary nature, a proper and equitable division of its burdens can not be accomplished. I do not argue that it would be better to make it permanent, but I call attention to this feature of the measure.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Granting that under a proper fiscal or revenue policy there would have been no need for this legislation, is the Senator clear in his mind that even under the Democratic policy there is a necessity for this so-called war-revenue tax?

Mr. BURTON. I am not sure of that. If there were, I should think it altogether better to impose it on a more limited number of articles. I do not believe in scattering it in this way. It is true that if this bill becomes a law the people will realize that burdens are imposed upon them, and some insist it is best to make taxes so varied that they will bear on the largest possible number, or at least on a very large number.

Mr. STERLING. The Senator, I think, recognizes on what the demand for this legislation is largely predicated, namely, that it would be injurious to business, and perhaps cause embarrassment to the national banks in which \$75,000,000 of Government funds are deposited to call in those deposits. Suppose the \$75,000,000 thus deposited in Government banks, according to the message of the President, and according to the report of the House committee, were available, would there be any necessity for this tax?

Mr. BURTON. No.

Mr. STERLING. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Under the Federal reserve bank act and the facilities supposed to be afforded by the provisions of that act in the way of furnishing money for times of stress, for crop-moving periods, and so forth, might not the banks be in part supplied, and they thus be furnished the money that would take the place of the \$75,000,000 that would be called in, or that is subject to call now by the Government, and which is in the hands of the banks?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, it was hoped that before this time the Federal reserve system would be in operation, so as to provide for all the needs of the different parts of the country a different currency. We have resuscitated the Aldrich-Vreeland Act, and a very large amount of currency has been issued upon it. I trust that the withdrawals will be made just as soon as possible.

Of course everyone recognizes what was the origin of this system of depositing in banks. The subtreasury system was established some 70 years ago, and very large amounts of money were lodged in the Federal Treasury or Government depositories, and at times the amount of currency there was so great as to interfere very materially with the ordinary course of business. In view of that the Treasury commenced the system of lending to banks. No one can blame the policy that brought that about; but I regard the fact that we are going to do away with it entirely as one of the greatest benefits received from the establishment of this new system.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITE in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. BURTON. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. If I understood the Senator from Ohio correctly, at the outset of his remarks he stated that the mistake here was in levying taxes instead of reducing the expenditures of the Government.

Mr. BURTON. I think so.

Mr. CULBERSON. Does the Senator believe that is practicable now, in view of the passage of the appropriation bills for the next fiscal year?

Mr. BURTON. In answer to that I will say that, for instance, there are appropriations for public buildings. Everyone knows that the Supervising Architect is some years behind in his work, perhaps three or four; and there are, no doubt, other departments of the Government where a certain amount of money could be held back. I would not believe in that as a general policy; but we hope that in a very few months, perhaps within a very few weeks, the \$75,000,000 deposited in the banks by the Treasury may be called in and made available for the payment of expenses.

Mr. CULBERSON. I simply wanted the opinion of the Senator on the proposition whether we could reduce expenditures now, rather than raise taxes.

Mr. BURTON. Oh, we can not repeal the appropriation bills; no.

Mr. CULBERSON. The issue, then, was presented to the party in power to levy this tax or not. There was no revenue from which the expenditures could be paid, in view of the appropriation bills.

Mr. BURTON. You are intending this tax, however, not merely for the payment of appropriations already made but for the payments of appropriations hereafter to be made.

Mr. CULBERSON. It is to cover expenditures for the next fiscal year ending in July, 1915.

Mr. BURTON. Not all of it is for that period. Do I understand that the Senator expects that this whole amount will be expended between now and the 30th of June, 1915?

Mr. CULBERSON. Oh, not necessarily.

Mr. BURTON. There is still a chance for economy between now and the 4th of March that would in a great measure obviate the necessity of any tax of this kind, and for any so-called war-revenue bill.

Of course I join with others in my dislike of this method of bringing in a bill here, after consideration by a caucus or conference, or whatever the dominant party may prefer to call it, and when we are led to understand that the bill must be passed in this form, and that whatever protests are uttered against it will be futile.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I should like to ask just one further question of the Senator from Ohio. I note that he read a telegram in regard to a tax on proprietary medicines, and so forth. I note by the report of the committee that the sum of \$4,000,000 is expected to be raised from this tax. I think it is stated in one of the telegrams read by the Senator that this tax will fall upon the consumers or users of the medicines. I should like to ask the Senator what, in his opinion, is the class of people that will be most affected by this kind of a tax, as to their financial conditions or circumstances?

Mr. BURTON. They are by no means among those most fortunate in the possession of means. I am inclined to think that in the earlier enforcement of the law, if this tax becomes a settled part of it, the druggists will bear a very large part of this tax.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suppose we all are anxious to get through with this legislation, as it is supposed to denote the end of the school. I am therefore going to say what I have to say without very much preparation or previous consideration. I would have preferred to speak on so important a subject more in detail and after more thorough investigation, but I am not willing to prolong the agony of the inevitable, for the bill is to pass.

Mr. Gladstone, in one of his great budget speeches, made in 1861, used this language:

But I think that when in an extended retrospect we take notice of the rate at which we have been advancing for a certain number of years we must see that there has been a tendency to break down all barriers and all limits which restrain the amount of public charge. For my own part, I am deeply convinced that all excess in the public expenditure beyond the legitimate wants of the country is not only a pecuniary waste—for that, although an important, is yet a comparatively trifling matter—but a great political, and, above all, a great moral evil. It is a characteristic, sir, of the mischiefs which arise from financial prodigality that they creep onward with a noiseless and a stealthy step; that they commonly remain unseen and unfelt until they have reached a magnitude absolutely overwhelming; and then at length we see them, such and so great as they now appear to exist in the case of one, at least, among the great European States—I mean the Empire of Austria—so fearful and menacing in their aspect and so large in their dimensions that they seem to threaten the very



foundations of national existence. Sir, I do trust that the day has come when a check is beginning among ourselves to be put to the movement in this direction. I think, as far as I have been able to trace the sentiments of the House and the indications of general opinion during the present session, that the tendency to which I have alluded is at least partially on the decline. I trust it will altogether subside and disappear.

The great English statesman did not live to see the realization of his hope as to a decline in public expenditures. On the other hand, he lived to see an accentuation of the extravagant spirit of his age, and if he were alive now he would find his country enmeshed in a system of expenditures which are so stupendous that it becomes a matter of necessity each and every recurring year for the chancellor of the exchequer to find some new thing upon which to levy a new tax. He searches the industrial world like a watchman on his beat, and if he finds any line of life not taxed to the limit he lays on another burden. Even before the present conflict in Europe the English people were weighed down with taxes to meet the expenses of an ever-growing budget. What the cost which will fall upon them now means in suffering and misery one shudders to contemplate.

Samuel J. Tilden is one of the few public men in America who earned the right to speak upon the subject of public economy. He sealed his professions by his acts. No one understands the rule or can unravel the judgment or decrees of the court of fame. If it were otherwise, it would be interesting to know why Samuel J. Tilden has never taken a more prominent place in popular favor. He had many of the qualities, the clear vision, the steady purpose, the unwavering courage, and the undoubted patriotism of that exceptional group of men who organized the Government. He was a statesman in the broad and most wholesome sense of the term. Upon an important occasion he used these words:

Another evil of such a system of excessive taxation is that it creates and nourishes a governmental class, with tendencies to lessen services and to enlarge compensation, to multiply retainers, to invent jobs, and foster all forms of expenditures, tendencies unrestrained by the watchful eye and firm hand of personal interest which alone enable private business to be carried on successfully. In other countries such a class has found itself able, sometimes by its own influence and sometimes in alliance with the army, to rule the unorganized masses. In our country it has become a great power, acting on the election by all the methods of organization, of propagating opinion, of influence, and of corruption. The system, like every living thing, struggles to perpetuate its own existence.

Every useful and necessary governmental service at a proper cost is productive labor. Every excess beyond that, so far as it is saved by the official, merely transfers to him what belongs to the people. So far as such excess is consumed, it is a waste of capital as absolute as if wheat of equal value were destroyed by fire or gold were sunk in the ocean.

There is a great deal of wisdom in that paragraph which most statesmen deem it good politics to ignore. But Tilden lived close to his faith, and our people would be happier if we would apply with more sincerity and with greater determination his teachings.

Mr. President, the power to tax is the power to destroy. There is no power of the Government more unrestrained and none so illy and unsystematically, inequitably, and harassingly used. The private citizen is perfectly powerless to defend himself against the taxing power if his representatives betray him. The tax if levied must be paid, and the taxgatherer has neither discretion nor conscience. The tax is either enforced by that subtle method which collects it at the time the citizen pays for his food or his clothes or summarily. It leaves him no appeal from its injustice or its inequity. The citizen has no other source of protection than the intelligence, conscience, and wisdom of his representative. There is no function which is performed about which he should proceed with so much caution, deliberation, and consideration as that of levying a tax. And yet I venture to say that there is no business about which we proceed with such reckless disregard of the interests of those whom we represent.

No better or fitter illustration of the power through taxes to destroy or the bungling use of the power could be found than is now before us. At a time when we are boasting that we are at peace with all the world, including both our friends Carranza and Villa, and at a time when the people of our country are, many of them, out of employment, when business is depressed, salaries being reduced, and worry and anxiety are accompanying many a man to his home at night, we are stealing about here and there trying, like the fomenters of the French Revolution, to find something to tax. At a time when the business world and the citizen are curtailing all expenditures possible and looking wearily for relief our Government is reveling in a riot of extravagance. I am reminded of some lines from one of the historians recounting conditions just before the French Revolution:

Taxes ran into everything. The minister who could invent a new tax was lauded as a man of genius. \* \* \* The imposition of the tax was entirely arbitrary. No man could tell when or what his tax

would be next. There was no principle in the assessment, except to extort as much as possible. The taxgatherers would be sent into a district to collect one year one million francs and perhaps the next year it would be two millions.

We are not nearing a French Revolution, but we have already approached the time when those who can invent a new tax are looked upon as men of genius. We have approached a time when the imposition of the tax is entirely uncertain and arbitrary, when the citizen does not know anything about what his burden is to be from one month to another. We have reached the time when there is no principle in the assessment, except to extort money and pay for our extravagance. I look upon this whole scheme of this special tax as indefensible and intolerable and as the culmination of a series of months of unwarranted and indefensible extravagance in governmental expenditure, and if the people of this country had any means or method by which to reject it or protect themselves they would employ it at once.

Mr. President, ours is at best an expensive Government. We have our Federal Government and our State governments, with their separate officers and their body of taxes. This double government must necessarily be expensive, but it is worth all we should in sound economy have to pay for it. Then we have our county and city governments, with their separate officers and their body of taxes. But no citizen, nevertheless, would ever have cause to complain if we would practice economy in public affairs to the slightest extent. It is not too much to say that we are a profligate and wasteful Government. It seems to be considered very generally that an appropriation secured is an evidence of statesmanship, while too often it is an evidence of the most shiftless and irresponsible kind of politics. Extravagance is the most persistent enemy of government, and has destroyed the happiness and prosperity of more people than war or pestilence. And, moreover, extravagance is a thing which does not seem to abate with the growth of civilization. It is more vicious in modern times than it was in ancient times. We are in every sense extravagant to a degree that is discouraging. No better proof of that could be had than the present situation.

Mr. President, I claim the right to discuss the subject of extravagance to some extent without being charged with partisanship, although I have no objection to being considered a partisan, for the reason that more than once since I have been here I have undertaken to call attention to it. The first debate in which I took any part of any moment in the Senate Chamber was in regard to this very subject, at a time when the party of which I am a humble member was in power. But there can be no better evidence of the reckless extravagance of this Government than that which we have before us at this time. Not only do present conditions accentuate our tendency to spend without regard to those who pay, but it discloses a most remarkable exhibition of party duplicity.

I am going, in the first place, to call attention to the standard which was given us at the time when we were about to pass into the hands entirely of a new party, or rather a new administration under a party which had long been out of power. It was believed that if there could be a check in this extravagance it would occur immediately afterwards and at least for a time after the new broom was invoked. But how powerful and how strong this tendency is can be shown in no better way than by calling attention to the situation as it was at the time the party went into power, the standard which it set up for itself, and the record which it has made since. I shall take its own standard, its own record, and the facts furnished by its own people in order to present the view of it which I propose to present. The record is its own, unchallenged and unimpeachable.

When they announced their platform at Baltimore our friends used this language:

We denounce the profligate waste of the money wrung from the people by oppressive taxation through the lavish appropriations of recent Republican Congresses, which have kept taxes high and reduced the purchasing power of the people's toil. We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

If our friends had no more than approached the amount of expenditures which had preceded their inauguration into power, if they had no more than equaled the amount which had been expended during the immediate previous Congresses, what would be their position with reference to this subject of extravagance? It would seem that they would still be clearly within the inhibition and within the anathema which they had assessed upon their predecessor. But what is the situation? It is not that it has been equaled, and thereby is subject to their own charge of extravagance, but it has far exceeded during the last 18 months that of the previous Congresses or the previous



months of the previous administration. That which they denounced as shameless waste approaches economy in the light of the record of these past 18 months. With this stern denunciation fresh upon the lips of Democracy we find all about the indisputable evidence of her insincerity and her want of candor.

I call attention, Mr. President, before presenting some figures, to some previous statements in regard to their view of extravagance and their purpose to inaugurate an era of economy such as "befits a democratic government." Mr. FITZGERALD, in his speech of 1910, says:

Controlling both Houses by substantial majorities, the responsibility for the appropriations belongs to the Republicans. Try as they may, they can not be other than wasteful, extravagant, inefficient. There can be no hope for any reductions from the Republican Party. The best interests of the country and the people demand a Democratic House. In no other way can expenditures be brought back to their normal level and taxes levied and collected for the sole purpose of defraying the legitimate expenses of the Government economically administered.

We have, I think, as demonstrated by this condition of affairs, a right to say that this is perhaps the greatest Government in the history of the world, because it has the capacity apparently of running itself and running itself against the mistakes of those who have been selected to administer it. When Mr. FITZGERALD made this statement in the House of Representatives, he made a solemn appeal to the people of this country and, as one of the leaders of his party, a solemn pledge that in case the party was placed in power there would be retrenchment and an economical administration of the Government.

It is not, Mr. President, because of the politics alone which may be said to lie in the charge, but it is a broader and deeper question than that, and that is whether we have arrived at the time when, in spite of pledges and promises, we are utterly unable to check this tendency toward such unwarranted and riotous extravagance.

Is there no confidence to be placed in the men who are selected from time to time and from year to year, and will this extravagance ever cease until such a condition of affairs arrives as that it may be more costly in the manner chosen to get rid of this extravagance than the extravagance itself?

I read, also, from a statement of the premier made at the Minnesota fair in 1908. He said:

The Democratic platform makes Republican extravagance one of the issues of the present campaign. The Republican platform is silent on the subject, and naturally so; to have promised economy would have been a mockery and to have defended the appropriations made by the last Congress would have been impossible.

At that time, Mr. President, the appropriations amounted to five hundred million. Now they amount to almost a billion two hundred million.

Why is it that the Republican Party is so much more extravagant than the Democratic Party in the expenditure of the public money? There are two reasons: First, because the Republican leaders are more intimately associated with the tax eaters than the taxpayers.

I am wondering if that situation has been in any degree reversed. I am reminded of a cartoon which I saw about the time the Democratic Party went into power. It represented a coon leaving the Republican tree and making his way as fast as he could for the Democratic tree. That coon was supposed to be the special interests, or the tax eater. Whether he has solidly and securely locked himself in the branches of that umbrageous tree or not I do not know, but a person could almost convict the party upon the statement of the distinguished leader of the Democratic Party himself. Then he goes on to say:

They hear the hungry clamor of the men who spend money more than they do the protest of the masses who contribute revenue.

I have no quarrel with the distinguished and able leader of his party in the announcement of his principles; I do not even complain of his bitter arraignment, but I leave those who essay the task to reconcile the statement with the actual conditions as they now exist.

I now quote from the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON], long a most able advocate of the tenets of his party on this floor:

Mr. President, this record of extravagance under the administration of President Roosevelt is astonishing. It should arrest public attention, whether it does or not, and it should provoke immediate and thorough reformation in our governmental expenditures, for it is a menace to the Treasury.

The Government of the United States is rapidly becoming paternalistic, the people office ridden, and the Nation itself threatened with the blight of militarism.

This is from a speech in the Senate on May 29, 1908. Col. Roosevelt's administration was one which accomplished great things and was calculated to be an extravagant one, but the figures there denounced as indefensible and menacing are

millions below those figures which now mark a return "to that simplicity and economy which befit a democratic government."

Now, Mr. President, let us take the language of the same gentleman upon the situation in order that we may be fair upon this proposition and that there may be no misrepresentation and in order that it may not with truth be said that these are but partisan attacks. Mr. FITZGERALD said during this session of Congress:

In a few months I shall be called upon in the discharge of my official duties to review the record that this Democratic House shall have made in its authorization of the expenditures of the public money. When ever I think of the horrible mess that I shall be called upon to present to the country on behalf of the Democratic Party I am tempted to quit my place.

Fortunately for the country the distinguished leader did not resign, as he is really one of the true friends of economy.

I quote further from the same leader:

I am looking now at Democrats who seem to take amusement in soliciting votes on the floor of the House to overturn the Committee on Appropriations in its effort to carry out the pledges of the Democratic platform. They seem to take it to be a huge joke not to obey their platform, and to make ridiculous the efforts of the members of our party who do try to live up to the promises they made to the people.

We charged the Republicans for 12 years of my service in the House under Republican administration with being grossly extravagant and reckless in the expenditure of the public money. I believed that charge to be true. I believed that my party, when placed in power, would demonstrate that the charges we had made in good faith were true. We are entitled to the help and to the support of the Members on this side of the House in honest efforts to carry out the pledges of the Democratic Party and in our attempts to show that what we charged in order to get into power was true. We have not had that support. Our Democratic colleagues have not given that support to us thus far during this session of Congress. They have unnecessarily piled up the public expenditures until the Democratic Party is becoming the laughing-stock of the country.

Mr. President, in commenting upon this statement of Mr. FITZGERALD, a most distinguished leader of true democracy, who bears the same relation to the present administration, it is generally believed, that Christopher Columbus does to America, said:

Primarily, the blame for wastefulness, so gross and deliberate as to constitute flagrant violation of a positive pledge, must attach to the House of Representatives, which brazenly ignored the repeated admonitions of Chairman FITZGERALD.

Democratic Senators have been hardly less heedless, and we believe it to be a fact that the only reduction effected by an executive department was \$120, reported to have been saved by the Secretary of State.

Everyone familiar with current literature will recognize that this is from the trenchant and fearless pen of Col. Harvey, editor of the North American Review. I think the charge here made must have been taken as not only true, but kindly and modestly expressed, for the print carries the information that immediately after its appearance Col. Harvey appeared at the White House to discuss "conditions in Europe"—a wise counselor—but many will regret if the consultation did not include some matters which happened before the war and which will be here after the war is closed.

But that was a mistake, Mr. President, about the \$120 in the State Department. There was an original saving of \$120, but finally, before the bill passed, it was changed, and that reduction was eliminated. So they are entitled to a straight record; there was no change in the program, no ground for such a charge of inconsistency.

Mr. President, these are earnest statements upon the part of those who are in a position to know and who are not prejudiced, I presume, against their party. I am going to support their statements in a few moments by a few facts and figures.

But I want to say this now, that the only thing in the world that the war had to do with this tax is the christening of it. This tax would have been necessary within a very few months at the rate that we were going had Europe been as peaceful as the District of Columbia. It would not have come so soon, but the rate at which we were spending, the recklessness with which we were creating offices and providing salaries, would have brought it on in due time.

Take their own figures, Mr. President. We are seeking here to raise \$105,000,000 by taxation. If this \$105,000,000 is about \$205,000,000 more than the amount which the Republicans expended and if, according to the statement which you have made time and time again, the Republicans were extravagant, will it not be admitted without further argument that the logic of the situation is that this \$105,000,000 is due to an extraordinary expenditure of Government funds? If we had reached the limit, as you said, where we were subject to condemnation, and you have exceeded it by \$105,000,000, will anyone have the temerity to say to the people of this country that the excess of levy is due to the war in Europe? If you are spending nearly two hundred million more than the amount which those now in power declared to be grossly extravagant, how can you justify

this tax? If you had practiced the economy even of your predecessor in power, you would not now be raising this hundred million, and the fact that revenues decreased would not have hurt your Treasury—you would have had sufficient in the Treasury, notwithstanding the falling off of revenues.

But that is not all. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], in discussing the river and harbor bill, said that this was but the beginning and there is more to follow. He said:

I believe it is the duty of the Senate to have some regard for the condition of the Treasury. We are now preparing to go out into the highways and byways and levy additional taxes. We are now engaged in the selection of items upon which we can raise additional revenue to the extent of \$100,000,000. No man who does me the honor to listen to me on this occasion can tell how long it will be before there will be another emergency that will require an additional levy.

And that is true. This does not include the \$25,000,000 that we are to pay to Colombia. This does not include the \$3,000,000 that we are to pay Nicaragua for another right of way for a canal, the purpose of it being, I presume, that, having built one canal and given it to England, we feel now under the necessity of building another canal and giving it to Germany.

This does not include, Mr. President, the contemplated \$30,000,000 for ships. This does not include the forty-odd million dollars which, we are told upon the side, it has been scheduled shall be put through at the coming session to cover a rivers and harbors bill. This does not include the deficit which will be made up by an emergency bill after the close of this Congress. I venture to say that we will have another levy, regardless of what goes on in Europe, and I venture to say that when the books shall have been closed out, instead of being \$105,000,000 in excess of the Government expenditures of the preceding Congress, this Congress will have incurred liabilities and expended in excess of \$250,000,000 over that of the previous Congress.

Yet we say that it is due to the war. The war might have had something to do with the amount which we have collected, but it has had nothing to do with the amount which we have expended or which we should have expended.

The total appropriation up to date, as near as I can secure accurate figures, is not less than \$1,117,463,777. This does not include, as I have said, the rivers and harbors bill nor the other expenditure to which I have made reference. No one places the amount at less than \$1,089,408,777, which is not less than \$60,000,000 at the present time in excess of the last Republican Congress.

But, Mr. President, this extravagance has just begun. We are inaugurating with marvelous speed and remarkable inconsiderateness a system of government which will devolve upon the people of this country a burden of taxation the like of which the people have never for a moment contemplated. We propose now, sir, to have an expert, a special agent, an investigator, to accompany every citizen and to oversee every business and every line of industrial activity. The present thus being presented to the people may be what they want, but I warn them now it will be costly beyond anything they have contemplated. Such a system fattens by what it feeds upon. It creates a governmental class always complaining of too much service and too little pay; it invents jobs and fosters all forms of waste and expenditures. We have to-day in the Federal service near 500,000 employees, and we have laid the basis for 50,000 more at this session.

Let us read a portion of the platform again:

We demand a return to that simplicity and economy which befits a democratic government and a reduction in the number of useless offices, the salaries of which drain the substance of the people.

I would be interested to know, Mr. President, what office has been abolished, what number of salaries have been disposed of, and wherein the principle of economy has been invoked in this system of creating offices and providing salaries which drain the substance of the people.

There have been more offices created and more salaries provided for in the last 18 months than during any three years in the history of this Government; and, in my opinion, we have just started. Let me call attention to some of the facts in regard to that, in the matter of detail.

When our Democratic friends came into power there were 3,183 persons employed in the Treasury Department. Instead of this number being reduced it has been increased by 358 in the city of Washington alone. When they came into power there were in the field force of the Treasury Department 1,407 persons, and under this economy program the number has been increased 678 persons more. In these two instances the economy of our friends will cost the Government \$1,750,000.

The new currency law created five new offices, with salaries of \$12,000 each, and increased the salary of the Comptroller of the Currency from \$5,000, at which sum it had remained for 50 years, to \$12,000. The new Trade Commission act creates five

commissioners at \$10,000 each and a secretary at \$5,000, and that is only an intimation of what that will be.

The Interstate Commerce Commission deals with about 2,200 corporations. The cost of running the Interstate Commerce Commission last year was \$1,833,269. We have in the United States about 305,000 corporations. Out of this 305,000 about 163,000 will come under the Trade Commission's jurisdiction, if it sees fit to exercise the jurisdiction.

So, Mr. President, if we should provide or make an allowance such as is based upon the expenditure of the Interstate Commerce Commission the operation of the Trade Commission alone would amount to \$1,367,000,000 a year. But suppose it only amounts to one-half that, and if it ever amounts to anything at all in the way of effective service it will have to amount to at least one-half of that.

Those things, Mr. President, it may be the people desire and will approve of, but there should be no longer any complaint about extravagance in the way of the operation of the Government, because if the people of the United States want their entire business done at Washington they will have to pay for it. If they want these matters to be overseen and controlled and regulated 1,000 miles or 2,000 miles from their homes they will have to pay for it. But whether it shall prove satisfactory to the people or not, this much is true: The amount of the governmental expenditures heretofore in the operation of the Government at Washington will be comparatively small and modest compared with the amount of expenditure which will be made in all future years if we continue to enlarge upon these bureaus.

Already for this year the actual expense of our departments at this time is \$3,000,000 a month in excess of the last year of the Republican administration. That is not by reason of the fact that there has been any defalcation or anything of that kind, but it is because of constantly enlarging and creating offices, providing salaries, and providing for those people who shall do those things that ought to be imposed upon the individual citizen himself to do under the observance of some law which had been passed for his guidance. That is only a beginning of what we may expect in a very short time if these bureaucratic practices continue.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. As I said a moment ago, it may be that we have less to spend; but no one can disclose here, in my judgment, a single fact to show that any of the expenditures made thus far have been by reason of the European conflict.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCUMBER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has just said that we are spending \$3,000,000 a month more than in the corresponding period of last year in the departments of the Government. He is unusually modest in that statement, because I have before me a Treasury statement to the effect that the expenditures from the 1st of July to the 8th of October of this year were \$228,602,000, while for the corresponding period last year they were \$215,325,000, or more than \$13,000,000 greater this year in three months and eight days than they were in the corresponding period last year.

Mr. BRISTOW. Were those expenditures for the departments alone?

Mr. WEEKS. These are the general disbursements of the Government.

Mr. BORAH. I was speaking of departmental expenses alone.

Mr. WEEKS. I did not so understand the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will observe, the figures referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] show an increase of over \$4,000,000 per month in the expenditures for this year. Then I wish to inquire of the Senator if anyone who defends this new system of taxation, and urges that it is necessary on account of the European war, has undertaken to set forth what revenue has been lost because of that war? Of course no one will claim that there has been any increase in expenditure because of the war, except the money which the Secretary of State has taken from the Treasury to bring back some people who had been visiting in Europe and who were slightly inconvenienced because of the hostilities. I have not been able to see why those of the American people who are compelled to stay at home and labor for a living should be taxed in order to bring people back from Europe who go there on



pleasure. I suppose the Secretary of State can explain that. But has anyone shown that the Government has lost any revenue, and if so, how much, because of the European war?

Mr. BORAH. I have not seen any figures to that effect.

Mr. BRISTOW. Does not the Senator from Idaho think that before these are styled "war taxes" there ought to be some evidence of some kind before the Senate that the deficit in the Treasury has resulted from the European war?

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President, I look at it in this way: Suppose there had been a decrease in the revenues. Assume, for the sake of argument, that there had been. That has nothing to do with the amount which we have expended. If we have expended \$200,000,000 more than we should have expended under an economical administration of the Government, the fact that the revenue has been cut off so as to limit the continuation of this extravagance is one question, but it does not have anything to do with the other proposition, although, of course, I see the pertinency of the Senator's suggestion from another standpoint; but as to the question of how much we are expending, and as to whether or not this is due to extravagance, can be proven by showing how much we have expended, regardless of how much we would have expended if the revenue should have held out. I think that the decrease in the revenue was evidenced quite conclusively before the European war began.

The decrease in revenue began some six months ago, and there has been a decrease each month since then. I do not know whether the percentage of decrease has increased each month, but the decrease continued each month up to the beginning of the European war. It might be, possibly, that the war when it came accentuated to some extent that condition, but that does not reach the question that we have already expended this year more money than we should have expended if we had had millions of dollars coming into the Treasury.

But I proceed. A new board of appeals, consisting of three members, at \$4,000 each, has been created in the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

For commercial attachés, to be appointed by and compensated at such salaries as the Secretary of Commerce may fix, and a clerk for each, at \$1,500, and for traveling expenses, the sum of \$100,000 was appropriated for a year.

The salary of the private secretary to the Secretary of the Treasury was increased from \$2,500 to \$3,000, which means that the salaries of the private secretaries of the other nine Cabinet officers must also be increased from \$2,500 to \$3,000.

The salary of a chief of division, created less than a year ago under the income-tax law, has been increased from \$2,500 to \$3,500.

Six Assistant Attorneys General in the Department of Justice have had their salaries increased from \$5,000 to \$7,500 each.

The salary of the assistant to the Attorney General was increased during the extra session on an urgent deficiency bill from \$7,000 to \$9,000.

The salaries of our diplomatic representatives in Argentina, Chile, and Spain were raised from \$12,000 to \$17,500 each per annum, and the salaries of the three secretaries of the legations to those countries were increased from \$2,625 to \$3,000 each.

The mission to Paraguay and Uruguay was divided and a new minister authorized, with a new salary of \$10,000.

In the Pension Office 40 special examiners, at \$1,300 each, heretofore employed to facilitate settlement of claims for pensions for old soldiers, and whose appointments were controlled by civil-service law, were abolished. In their places five special examiners, at \$1,300 each, who are not under the civil service, but are political appointments, were provided for.

I have no doubt, Mr. President, that this bill will pass as it has been written, but it is only another milestone in the terrific rate which we are traveling along the highway of extravagance. But if it is to pass, let us be candid with the people and tell them why it is passing and why it is necessary to pass it—to meet our vast expenditures, to meet nothing less than brazen and unrestrained and unblushing extravagance. Let us be candid with those who put up the money.

Now, what are the conditions of the country from a business standpoint? What is the situation of the people upon whom we are imposing this tax? There is no occasion for exaggeration. A plain, simple statement of facts is quite sufficient. The securities of insurance companies and savings banks have shrunk in value during the last 18 months, and prior to August 1, \$500,000,000. We are advised that on August 1 the railroads of this country had defaulted in their bonds and notes to the extent of \$600,000,000. We are advised also that railroad revenues fell off during the last fiscal year to the extent of \$44,700,000. We are advised that business failures during the month of August, 1914, were to the amount of \$43,000,000, as against \$20,000,000 in 1913 and \$12,000,000 in 1912. We are

told also by those who are in a position to know that there are laboring men out of employment to the number of two and one-half millions, and a million more working on half time. We know, furthermore, that the cost of living has not been reduced, that the balance of trade has been going against us, and that business uneasiness and distress are not at all uncommon throughout the land. But in the midst of all this, of want and enforced idleness in some places, of business depression in many places, in the midst of the citizen's worry, the Government holds on its way undisturbed, exceeding the speed limit along the highway of extravagance. Taxation seems to recognize no signs of distress. Incomes may disappear, business houses put up their blinds, profits fade, railroads default in their securities, wages decrease and disappear, but taxes increase with a steady and even imperious movement. It is a strange and unnatural situation when a Government takes no notice of the conditions of its people when it comes to lay on the burdens of government. It is a cruel and arbitrary thing for a Government to exercise a power simply because it can do so, and without regard to the interest of the people who sustain the Government. We are but the directors and those men and women out yonder in the factory, field, and mine are the stockholders. To them we are bound by every tie of conscience, by every obligation of trusteeship, and by every sense of honorable consideration. But their protests here are utterly unheeded. They send us thousands of telegrams advising us of the situation, but we go on creating more offices, providing for more salaries, and spending more money, every dollar of which must come from them. Taxation is the only jubilant spirit among us all.

It seats itself upon the sepulcher,  
And of the triumphs of the ghastly foe  
Makes its own nourishment.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. Before the Senator closes, I desire to inquire what evidence have we that the \$105,000,000 will be needed to pay the expenses of the Government? The difference between the expenditures and the receipts this year as compared with last year—the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] can correct me if I am wrong, as he has the figures—is about \$9,000,000.

Mr. WEEKS. Thirteen million dollars for three months and eight days.

Mr. BRISTOW. The deficit is \$13,000,000 greater this year than for last year at this time.

Mr. TOWNSEND. For three months.

Mr. BRISTOW. If there is a deficit of \$13,000,000 in three months and eight days, which is more than one-quarter of a year, at the same rate we would need four times \$13,000,000, which would be approximately \$50,000,000. Why should we collect \$105,000,000, when the figures submitted by the Treasury Department and the evidence now before us show that we will only need \$50,000,000?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator does not take into consideration the constant increase of extravagance. We want \$50,000,000 to go on. We will create a new commission and some new offices when we get a little rest. There was not—

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator is of the opinion, then, that they want to collect from the people \$50,000,000 and have it lying in the Treasury for the purpose of paying it out for something which they have not now in mind?

Mr. BORAH. There is a treaty pending under which we are to pay to Colombia \$25,000,000; we shall have to get that money somewhere; and there is another treaty pending, which is being urged very earnestly now, to pay Nicaragua \$3,000,000. That makes \$28,000,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. I was curious to know why we were collecting \$100,000,000 when the record as presented by the Secretary of the Treasury shows that we do not need it. It has been intimated that the Federal Reserve Board, which is one of the new institutions which has been created and which is to cost the people a good many million dollars before it is through, want this money to put in favored banks throughout the country; that is, they want the Treasury full, and the way to get the Treasury full is to lay taxes upon the people and let this new board, which has the use of the money, dispose of it among the banks which are friendly to the administration. I wondered if that were so.

Mr. BORAH. How many members of the Trade Commission are there?

Mr. BRISTOW. I think there are five or seven.

Mr. PERKINS. Five.



Mr. BORAH. There will be expenses in connection with that board which will have to be taken care of. I understand that there is sufficient money now, according to the President's message, to meet these emergencies; but it is not deemed wise to take the money out of the banks.

Mr. BRISTOW. That would embarrass the banks. Of course it does not embarrass them any to take it out of the people's pockets; that is a good place to go to get the money, but do not take it from the banks; put more in the banks, so that the banks may loan it to the people from whom they are taking it at four times the rate of interest the Government is getting for it.

Mr. BORAH. The President's view of it was that if we took it out of the banks we would take it out of the channels of business, and therefore impair our present prosperity.

Mr. BRISTOW. But does not taking it from the people take it out of the channels of business?

Mr. BORAH. That depends on the kind of people from whom you take it. I suppose they are supposed to have located this tax where it will not hurt business.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. The Senator from Idaho alluded to "our present prosperity." I have been wondering what he meant by that.

Mr. BORAH. I do not pause to discuss the question now. The President says:

The Treasury itself could get along for a considerable period, no doubt, without immediate resort to new sources of taxation. But at what cost to the business of the community? Approximately \$75,000,000, a large part of the present Treasury balance, is now on deposit with national banks distributed throughout the country. It is deposited, of course, on call. I need not point out to you what the probable consequences of inconvenience and distress and confusion would be if the diminishing income of the Treasury should make it necessary rapidly to withdraw these deposits. And yet without additional revenue that plainly might become necessary, and the time when it became necessary could not be controlled or determined by the convenience of the business of the country.

Now, the Senator from Kansas will see the philosophy of the President. It is that this money is now in the hands of the banks. While it ought to be in the Treasury of the United States to pay public expenses, yet it has been deposited in the banks, and it is wiser to collect more taxes from the people than it is to pull this money back from the banks and put it into the Treasury.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, then, as I understand, the President thinks it is better to require the depositor to go to the banks and borrow the money to pay into the Treasury rather than to have the banks pay back to the Treasury the money which the Treasury has loaned them. The depositor is paying the banks from 6 to 8 per cent on the money of the Government, which is his money, which he gets from the bank, while the bank is paying the Treasury of the United States 2 per cent on it. So the financial theory of the President is that it is better to tax the depositor and get money from him to put in the banks, so that the banks may have money to loan him at 6 and 8 per cent, for which the banks are only paying the Government 2 per cent, than to require the banks to return to the Treasury the money the Government has loaned them. That is, as I understand, the theory of the President, and I wanted to inquire if the Senator has the same understanding or places the same interpretation upon his address?

Mr. BORAH. I understand that the President thinks it is unwise to withdraw Government money from the banks, because that would be to take it out of the channels of business; and that he is of the opinion that to tax the people and collect the money in that way is not to take it out of the channels of business. I may not interpret the message correctly, and I would not do the President an injustice. There may be another view.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. TOWNSEND. As I recall, some time in the thirties a transaction occurred in the United States similar to that proposed here. There was public money taken from the Treasury and loaned to the States. That money has never yet been returned to the Treasury. Inasmuch as 79 per cent of the \$75,000,000 deposited in the banks is now in one section of the country, there might be some possible reason for allowing the money that has already been loaned in that way to remain where it is. I have thought that that possibly might be another reason why it was not best at this time to withdraw the money that is now deposited in the favored banks of the United States.

Mr. BORAH. I agree with the proposition that in the present condition of business affairs it might be very disastrous to call for money anywhere in large amounts. I think that it would be likely to create a condition of affairs which would be serious.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that when the money is collected under the special tax which this bill levies it will be deposited by the Government in the banks, and if it is, will it not be necessary to levy another tax. Because if it is not right to take the money that we have in the banks out of the banks it will be wrong to take the money out of the banks when we put more money in the banks.

Mr. BORAH. I presume we ought to indulge in the assumption that this amount will be kept in the Treasury. The thing could happen which the Senator speaks of, though without any change in the program which has been heretofore followed.

Mr. President, the first and indispensable principle of any righteous system of taxation is economy. Any tax, however and wherever laid, whether upon the necessities or luxuries, upon the virtues or vices of men, beyond that necessary for the economical administration of the Government is nothing less than the exploitation of the people through the arbitrary and brutal power of the Government. It is true the people can pay this tax, and would do so were it many times heavier. But that is not the question. Economy in public expenditures makes for good citizenship; it builds up the moral fiber of the people; it strengthens their faith in their Government and augments and arouses their patriotism. It teaches economy and frugality in private affairs. It breeds confidence, and lights up the whole field of private endeavor with optimism and hope. It makes for a happy, contented, sturdy, hopeful people.

Instead, therefore, of laying more taxes, or putting heavier burdens upon the business world and upon wages, why not commence with this economy to which we have all time and time again most faithfully pledged ourselves? Extravagance has gone far enough to justly excite the alarm of the most conservative and patriotic men. The cancer spot may not be large, but it is a cancer just the same. No hour can be too early to cut it out. And even, sir, if all the honor and the glory should finally be accredited to the present leader of the Democracy, which his fondest admirers believe will be his, this excision would in the long course of the years, if followed up, exceed in glory all the rest. If he should establish the precedent of real economy and bring the Government back to a sane basis in this respect, while men might differ and disagree as to all other acts, the people would pay to him undivided homage for this.

Not a dollar of this money need be raised if we will but return to the most ordinary rules of decent public expenditures. Not a dollar of it would ever have been called for but for this riotous and shameless extravagance going on from year to year and apparently now in the high tide of reckless unrestraint. Let us concede that the war had something to do with the amount of revenue which we otherwise would have collected, yet the war has had nothing to do with the amount which we should have expended. Business men cutting salaries, wage earners unemployed, railroads defaulting in their obligations and plying for higher freight rates, enterprise hesitant, and initiative absent from the business world—certainly we can afford as a Government to stop and sober up, at least forego any further debauch until the people shall have spirit enough to in some measure tolerate it if not enjoy it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for amendment.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from North Carolina if he is prepared now to offer the committee amendments?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; as they are reached. I do not exactly know what the Senator means. The committee amendments are already indicated in the print which is before us, and I will offer them just as they are now to the bill. I have no amendments to offer at present except those that are in the printed bill.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I wanted to know.

The first amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 1, line 4, after the words "tax of," to strike out "\$1.50" and insert "\$1.75," so as to read:

That there shall be levied, collected, and paid in lieu of the tax of \$1 now imposed by law, a tax of \$1.75 on all beer, lager beer, ale, porter, and other similar fermented liquor, brewed or manufactured



and sold, or stored in warehouse, or removed for consumption or sale, within the United States, by whatever name such liquors may be called, for every barrel containing not more than 31 gallons; and at a like rate for any other quantity or for the fractional parts of a barrel authorized and defined by law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he has estimated the probable income from this provision.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have an estimate made by the department. The Senator will find that Senate Document No. 596, Sixty-third Congress, printed just this morning, gives all of these estimates. Does that answer the Senator's question? I will state, if the Senator has not the document before him—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It has just been handed to me.

Mr. SIMMONS. I supposed the Senator had the document before him.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator if there is anything discriminatory or sectional in this provision?

Mr. SIMMONS. I know of nothing discriminatory or sectional in it.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I will state to the Senator what I have in my mind. You propose to raise about half of the internal-revenue tax from this item, about \$43,000,000.

Mr. SIMMONS. A little over \$40,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Forty-three million dollars.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that only about 3.9 per cent of this amount will be collected in the South. I do not like to use the expression "south of Mason and Dixon's line," but just for the sake of geographical exactness I should like to remind him that only 3.9 per cent of this tax will be paid south of Mason and Dixon's line, including the States of Louisiana, Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma. Out of the total of \$66,000,000 to be collected from the tax on beer, the States south of the old line, which I hope exists only in memory, including the States of Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, will pay but \$2,700,000 of the beer tax. I am watching with a great deal of interest to see where my honored friend from North Carolina will lay this whole burden of new taxes—for it is a burden unusual and unnecessary. Are you to spread it equitably upon the entire country?

I do not pose as the champion of any special line of American production; but the very first item in this bill touches the South with a soft, glove-like touch that will not be noticed or even felt in the States for which the Senator from North Carolina seems to be so solicitous; 3.9 per cent of this burden will fall on the South, 94.1 per cent upon the Northern States. I hope, before you finish with this bill, there will be some provision spreading this burden equitably throughout the whole country. It is just a little less than shameful to think that the appropriations during the last year have gone southward and the tax northward; the privileges one way and the burdens another.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not think a single member of the committee—certainly not a single one of the majority membership of the committee—in considering any tax imposed in this bill had in mind for a minute any question of sectionalism; nor do I believe that the bill is open to the objection that it imposes a larger burden upon other sections of the country than it does upon the South.

I do not know whether the Senator's figures with reference to the amount of beer produced in the South, as compared with other sections of the country, are correct or not. I have made no inquiry about that matter, because I will say to the Senator that it never entered my mind to make inquiry about how much beer was made in this section or that section of the country.

The tax upon beer, like the tax upon a great many other commodities, is not a tax upon the community in which the product is made, but it is a tax upon the people of the country who consume that commodity. I do not know how much beer is consumed in the Senator's State or made in the State, and I do not care. I do not know how much is consumed in the South as compared with the North or the East or the West. I suppose the American people in all sections of the country drink beer to a greater or less degree. It is a consumption tax. It is imposed finally upon the man who buys the beer in kegs and the man who drinks the beer.

But, Mr. President, I think a complete and full answer to the Senator's criticisms, if any answer were needed, is found in the fact that the war-tax bill of 1898, framed by a Republican Congress, drafted by Mr. Dingley, of Maine, passed first by a Republican House and then by a Republican Senate and signed by a Republican President, raised one-third of its revenues from a tax upon beer; and the rate fixed in that bill, instead of being \$1.75 a barrel as is the rate fixed in this bill, was \$2 a barrel.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SIMMONS. Just one minute. I do not think anybody will accuse the Republican Party which passed that bill and the Republican President who signed it of any particular desire to favor the South more than any other section of the country; and if this bill, imposing a tax of \$1.75, bears evidence upon its face, as the Senator contends, of a purpose on the part of its authors to protect the South and to discriminate in favor of the South against other sections of the country, then that Republican measure, passed by a Republican Congress and signed by a Republican President, was subject to a greater extent to the same charge of sectionalism in behalf of the South.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina, in his inability to account for the present Treasury dilemma in which his party has been placed, goes back to 1898 and calls attention to what Mr. Dingley and President McKinley did. I was in Congress in 1898 and voted for that bill; but the author of the present deficiency bill, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and other Democrats, denounced that measure in vigorous terms in my hearing because of the excessive burden which he said it would impose upon the people of the country. We were then in war. War had been declared, against the wishes of President McKinley, at the instance of innumerable Democrats, both in this Chamber and in the other; and yet when a war tax was sought to be levied by an administration actually engaged in war we found no sympathy or cooperation or assistance from those who now rise and proclaim this a necessary measure because, forsooth, Europe is fighting.

I know how President McKinley tried to ward off a conflict at arms with Spain. Our friends upon the other side were fierce for war; but when it came to paying the necessary expenses of that war you voted against it. Now, when we are at peace with all the world, when the belligerent powers now engaged in war are felicitating our Government upon its neutrality—without a single cloud on the American horizon, unless it be the temporary dominance of the Democratic Party—we are asked to pass this so-called war-revenue bill.

How appealing the war-revenue bill must be to the country. The truth is, it is a deficiency bill. You have spent more money than you have taken in, and you have spent it recklessly. Now, when the administration is face to face with the necessity of issuing the bonds of the Government to get us out of the hole into which you have forced the country, Senators come in, under the guise of war, and proceed to levy additional taxes against your countrymen.

The analogy, Mr. President, is not good between the situation as it existed in 1898 and at present. Senators upon that side of the Chamber know it as well as I do. The analogy is not good. We voted Mr. McKinley \$50,000,000 and placed it in his hands after the war had begun; and, as the President said then, no one could tell where it would lead, but wherever it led we must assume all the responsibility for it. Out of the great wisdom of Congress, Mr. Dingley and some of his associates proposed that we should pay the expenses of that war as it went along, and pile no burden upon future generations. There was a strong desire upon the part of Democratic Members of the House at that time to put that burden upon future generations and thus avoid a temporary tax burden.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator know that at the same time they provided for the passage of the war-revenue bill they provided for the issuance of \$500,000,000 worth of bonds and the issuance of \$100,000,000 worth of Government certificates of indebtedness?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, yes, Mr. President, I know that there was a provision in that bill that certificates might be issued, and that the same provision is in the bill before us. Your administration has already issued emergency money. You did not regard it as wise to pay the expenses of the War with Spain by special war taxes then. Both your leader in the House and my friend the Speaker of the House, Mr. CLARK—for he is a friend, and I value him as a public man very highly—both those distinguished representatives of the majority party to-day voted against the war-revenue bill in 1898. At that time, if my recollection serves me right, the revenues of our Government were coming in in excess of our expenditures. Although when we came into power we found the country demoralized, our factories closed, our farmers discouraged, and laboring men idle all over this country because of unwise tariff laws, for which your party was responsible, we gathered together under the wise leadership of McKinley and passed the Dingley tariff law, and it revived our industries instantly, gave new hope to the people. We could have paid the expenses of the Spanish War out of the current revenues of the Government under that

law—a thing you could not do to-day. You can not pay the ordinary expenses of the Government out of the ordinary revenues of the Government because of miscalculation. That is what has brought you to this extremity. That is why you are so solemn. That is why no Senator within his hearing could answer the speech of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] this morning. That is why most of you left the Chamber. That is why not a word was said in reply to the severe and accurate and forceful indictment of the Senator from Utah.

The title of that Senate document, No. 596, is misleading on its face and untrue. This is not a war revenue bill at all. It is a deficiency revenue bill, due to the fact that you did not collect enough money from your income and revenue tax and your duties on imports to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government in time of peace.

Now, you may be able to convince the country that this is a war revenue bill; but if you had the frankness which you always had while we were in power you would acknowledge it as a deficiency bill, due to your mismanagement.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know whether I correctly understood the Senator a little while ago, but I think I understood him to say that we could have paid the expenses of the Spanish-American War out of the current revenues.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. One moment—up to the time that the special tax was levied.

Mr. SIMMONS. Which was—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Which was in June.

Mr. SIMMONS. June 13, 1898.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Admiral Dewey went into Manila Bay on the 1st of May. We had already purchased all available munitions of war at that time, and paid for them.

Mr. SIMMONS. We had purchased the munitions of war on June 13 and paid for them?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly; we had purchased the munitions of war and had them on hand; we could not go to war without munitions.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no; I am not mistaken. I know what the then Secretary of War said about it. He had been a distinguished soldier of the Civil War and knew what war was.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was just going to express some surprise at the statement of the Senator that we could have paid these expenses out of the current revenues, and at his statement that we had purchased and paid for the munitions of war out of the current revenues. The Senator says that this is a deficiency bill, and that there never was any necessity for any war-revenue taxes in 1898, because we had plenty of money in the Treasury. Now, I want to call the Senator's attention—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not use that expression at all. I did not say that we had plenty of money in the Treasury; we were just recovering from the Cleveland panic. I said that the expenses of the war could have been paid out of the current revenues.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. Now, I want to say to the Senator that the facts are these: At the close of the last fiscal year, after paying all of the ordinary expenses of the Government out of the ordinary receipts of the Government for that fiscal year, there was in the Treasury a surplus of \$34,000,000. Thirty-three and odd millions of that was applied to the payment of Panama Canal expenses, and therefore it was not necessary to sell the Panama bonds, as the law had provided. In 1897, the year before the Spanish-American war broke out, when the Republican Party was in control of the Government, instead of a surplus in the Treasury in that year the records show that there was a deficit in the Treasury of the United States of \$38,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly, Mr. President—chargeable to the Wilson tariff law.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let us get a little further away from the Wilson tariff law.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It was on the statute books at that time.

Mr. SIMMONS. Everything bad that happened five years before that act was passed the Senator thinks was attributable to it, and everything bad that has happened since that act was passed the Senator thinks is attributable to it. In 1897 there was a deficit in the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year of \$38,000,000. In 1898, the year in which the Spanish-American War was declared, on the 30th day of June of that year, when the war had been in progress but a short time, the deficit in

the Treasury—for there was a deficit that year, as there was the previous year—amounted to \$89,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes, Mr. President; and there never has been a deficit since until your party came into power.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was under the Dingley Act.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; but our bill had not become operative.

Mr. SIMMONS. When did your bill go into operation?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We did not have the benefits of our tariff legislation, and when it got fully underway not a single year after the passage of the Dingley law and the Spanish-American War was there a time when we did not have a surplus in our Treasury over expenditures.

Mr. SIMMONS. So if the Senator will permit me—and then I will not trouble him any further—we would have about this situation: The year before the Spanish-American War broke out, under a Republican administration, we had a deficit of \$38,000,000. The year in which it broke out we had a deficit of \$89,000,000. Yet the Senator says that we could have carried on that war and could have paid its expenses without levying any additional taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes; and I reassert it.

Mr. SIMMONS. As a matter of fact, we did levy that year additional taxes of \$100,000,000. We did authorize in that year an issue of \$500,000,000 of bonds. We did authorize in that year an issue of \$100,000,000 of Government certificates of indebtedness. We authorized the issue of bonds and certificates and imposed taxes for the purposes of that war of \$700,000,000. Yet the Senator from Michigan, with a deficit in the Treasury that year and the year before, seriously tells the Senate that we could have gone on without raising any additional taxation.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let us see about the statement of the Senator from North Carolina. President McKinley was not sworn in until the 4th day of March, 1897. Congress was promptly convened in extraordinary session, and I think the Dingley law was passed July 31 following. I assert without any hesitation whatever that there was never a year of the Dingley law when we did not have a surplus of revenues over expenditures, and it was the wise, cool-headed, calculating judgment of Mr. Dingley that provision was made to pay the expenses of the Spanish War as it ran along. A great many of us thought that it might be appropriately spread upon future generations, but wiser councils prevailed, and that law was put upon the statute books for the sole purpose of meeting the expenses of the Spanish War. Congress promptly placed \$50,000,000 in the hands of President McKinley to spend it as he desired. Now, we are at peace with all the world, and yet Senators upon the other side of the Chamber turn to our action as a precedent, when the conditions were entirely different.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator says there was no deficit under the Republican tariff. I should like to call his attention to the fact that in 1905 there was a deficit of \$18,750,000, and in 1908 there was a deficit of \$20,000,000. In 1909 there was a further deficit of \$58,000,000. I will further say to the Senator, and I think I could produce the evidence to show it if I had the time, that but for certain circumstances connected with the Panama expenditures there would have been a deficit during several other years.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, that is a mere conjecture and does not meet the situation at all. There is not a Senator on the other side of the Chamber who does not know that under the Dingley law we collected all the revenue needed to pay the ordinary expenses of the Government, and generally a large surplus.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will let me finish, I wish to call attention to another deficit under the Payne law, a positive deficit about which there is no conjecture, a deficit of \$18,000,000 in 1910.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Was there any other time during that law when there was a deficit?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is a positive deficit that I know of.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President; just the moment the country adjusted itself to the new law the revenues bounded, as they have always done to the protective principle, and we gathered all the revenue we needed and paid hundreds of millions out of current revenues for the work of building the Panama Canal.

Mr. President, we had ample revenue the year before the election of the Democratic Party to power, did we not? We were not suffering from lack of revenue in 1911 and the spring



of 1912. We were not suffering from lack of revenue right up to the time the Republican Party was divided and defeated, and we are only suffering now because of recklessness in making appropriations, miscalculation, and erroneous judgment in spreading the taxes of the Government, and I reassert what I said a few moments ago in regard to the very first item in this bill, the South escapes much of that burden.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, the Senator says when the Democrats came in they had ample funds in the Treasury. In the year 1912, the year before the Democrats came in, the Government borrowed \$33,000,000 of Panama bonds, and while using those bonds a balance of \$35,000,000 was turned over to them, but without the use of those Panama bonds they would have had a surplus of a little over \$2,000,000.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Tariff reduction was imminent in the summer of 1912, after the Chicago convention. And the present administration would have been obliged to pay for that expenditure at Panama if we had not done so. They have been relieved of a great deal of the expense we underwent in building the Panama Canal, and I think it does not lie in the mouths of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to charge that there has been any mismanagement on the part of any Republican administration in conducting the affairs of the Panama Canal or in its construction. The management of the Panama Canal is most creditable to the last administration. I do not think my friend from North Carolina can question it. We have left a very small burden for this administration to bear. Most of the expense has been met out of the ordinary revenues of the Government from day to day, with the result that you take over the political management of the Government's affairs with a very large percentage of the entire cost of constructing the Panama Canal off your hands.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not mean to attack, of course, the management of the Panama Canal under the past administration or under the present administration. The only point I was making was that we paid the entire expenses of last year's operation in the construction of the Panama Canal out of the current revenues, and during the year before we came in the Government sold its bonds for that purpose.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I repeat what I said a little while ago, that we could have paid the expenses of the Spanish-American War out of the current revenues of the Government under the Dingley law. I did not say they had that money on hand upon the 1st day of May, 1898; but I repeat that under that law and the income derived therefrom, the internal revenue and the customs duties, we could have paid the expenses of the Spanish-American War without levying a war tax at all.

Mr. SIMMONS. If it be true, as the Senator has said—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield further to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. If it be true that we could have paid the expenses of that war without any war taxes, without any increase in the issue of bonds, I ask the Senator why, then, did they impose this \$100,000,000 of additional taxes upon the people? There was no contention then that there was any falling off in the imports as a result of the war conditions. If it be true, as the Senator says, that they could have paid those expenses out of the current revenue, why did his party impose this additional tax of \$100,000,000? Why did his party issue \$198,000,000 of the \$500,000,000 of bonds authorized and cover that money into the Treasury, if it had no need for it?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from North Carolina asks exactly the same question that was asked in the House of Representatives when the war-tax bill was passed. There was scarcely a Democrat there who did not ask "Why the necessity for this imposition of extraordinary taxes?" and the only answer made to that question was made by Mr. Dingley, that this is an extraordinary situation, we are in war, and in order that we may spread this expense of this war, which is a just one, in the interests of humanity, in order that we may put them behind us and all the people may have the privilege of contributing toward that expense, the bill is to be passed. Senators who are on the other side of the Chamber to-day and who were at that time Members of the House of Representatives will bear me out in that statement.

But we were at war, in a vastly different situation than the one which confronts us to-day. The only war that you have on hand to-day is the warfare between your prophecies and

predictions of last year when the Senator from North Carolina was making this tariff bill. We told you upon this side of the Chamber when you enacted the law that it would not bring the necessary revenue to run the Government. We voted against it and we begged you not to pass it. We told you not to forfeit the sugar duties and the duties on iron ore and lumber and wool, and many other items; but you went blindly on and did just as you have always done before—led the country direct to the pit from which you are now trying to extricate yourselves by the extraordinary imposition of \$100,000,000 of special taxes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. BRISTOW. This is labeled a war-revenue bill, and yet there is not in the report of the committee nor has there been stated to the Senate a single fact in concrete form to indicate that the European war made necessary this additional taxation. It has not increased the public expenditures. It may have decreased the revenues, but the amount and the way in which such revenues may have been decreased has not been set forth. The amount of the revenue that can be charged to the falling off of the importations from Europe has not been concretely and definitely given us, so that we know whether it aggregates \$107,000,000 or not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of calling the attention of the chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from North Carolina, to the fact that on the first page of his bill he has so arranged the law, if it becomes operative, that the States south of Mason and Dixon's line, and including the States of Louisiana, Texas, Kansas, and Oklahoma, pay 3.9 per cent of the vast amount to be collected from that source, and if the effect of this legislation is sectional, you have devised it. I do not understand that you conferred with anybody on this side of the Chamber regarding the matter.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator say that I admitted this legislation is sectional?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I said if it was sectional, you are responsible for it, because you did not confer with anybody on this side of the Chamber about the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator mean to say that this act imposing a tax of \$1.75 per barrel on beer could be sectional and in favor of the South?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It works out that way.

Mr. SIMMONS. And does the Senator say the act of 1898, which imposed \$2 on beer, was not sectional?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That will not let the honored Senator away from the point I make—that the Southern States I have referred to will pay but \$2,700,000 of the revenue duty levied on beer under this provision, while the other States in the Union will pay over \$40,000,000 of this amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now upon the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not conceive that anybody except the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] believes for a minute that this beer tax is a sectional tax in the sense in which he makes the charge. I think the answer I make to him—that it is a tax upon consumption, and therefore applies to the beer drinker all over the country, whether in the South or somewhere else—is amply sufficient. But it can not be sectional in favor of the South unless the bill passed by his own party was also sectional.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Will the Senator yield for a question just there?

Mr. SIMMONS. In just a minute. So far as the amount of collections is concerned, I do not know where the Senator got his figures, but I am advised that the amount actually paid by the South under the tax on beer amounted to 13½ per cent.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I ask the Senator just how the consumer is going to pay this tax on beer? In what way will he pay it? Will there be an additional price for a glass of beer or will it be reduced?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not worked that out myself. It has been suggested that during the Spanish-American War they accomplished that purpose by making the glasses a little smaller. I do not know how they will do it, but I do know that it is going to be passed on to the consumer in some way or other.

Mr. President, there is one other thing I want to refer to in answer to the Senator from Michigan. The Senator says that this tax is necessary because of the breaking down of the Democratic tariff act. It is amazing to me, Mr. President, that any Senator can make a statement of that sort upon the floor of the Senate of the United States in face of the fact that during the



past year the receipts of the Government under the Democratic tariff exceeded the expenses of the Government in that year \$34,000,000. Undoubtedly, therefore, the receipts from the tariff last year were sufficient. So far as the present year is concerned, if there had been no European war, if conditions in this country had remained normal, as they were during the last year, the tariff law would have been amply sufficient to have provided all the revenues that the Government would have needed.

I believe it was the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow] who said a little while ago that we had not undertaken even so much as to show why it was necessary to impose this additional tax if the tariff was sufficient under ordinary circumstances to support the Government.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SIMMONS. I was proceeding to answer the question the Senator asked me a little while ago.

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand, and I am obliged to the Senator, but I should like to have him state particularly and specifically wherein this revenue has been lost. A general statement may be the opinion of the Senator from North Carolina, but what definite and particular articles of importation have failed to come in, which otherwise would have come in, and what revenue has actually been lost in the decline of those importations?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have before stated that, Mr. President; I stated that on last Friday. The Senator from Kansas says I stated it in general terms. The Senator is mistaken about that. I gave some facts which showed the loss of revenue. Now, let me say—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will permit me, I will answer his question.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, so that he may understand just exactly what I ask, I desire to say the Senator has stated that there had been a loss in revenue of so much per month, but the Senator has not pointed out what caused that loss of revenue.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Spanish-American War was a very small war; it disturbed to some extent the trade conditions of this country for a very short time. In a few weeks after that war had been begun, so far from the effect being disastrous to trade, so far from its affecting injuriously our imports as a source of customs revenue, it helped business and it helped importations. There was no necessity for a war tax in 1898 to make up any loss of revenue through the customhouse or any loss of revenue through the internal-revenue system of taxation. The necessity in that case for a tax was to provide money to pay the extraordinary expenses incident to the prosecution of the war. We had no money on hand. There was a deficit in the Treasury. War was going inevitably to greatly increase the expenses of the Government, and it was necessary to levy additional taxes for the purpose of getting that money.

When the European war broke out we were receiving, through our customhouses and through the operations of our internal-revenue and income-tax laws, ample revenue to support the Government. If nothing had transpired as a result of the war in Europe to reduce the receipts of the Government under the operation of its tariff laws there would be no necessity for this additional taxation, but, Mr. President, this is a war in which practically a whole continent is engaged, and the continent engaged in this war is the great industrial continent of this world. Ten millions of men upon that continent who have been producers of wealth, who have been producers of commodities, a part of which have come to this country and paid taxes and given us revenue, are now in the field engaged in battle. There are 5,000,000 more men upon that continent who were engaged in productive pursuits who have had to leave the fields, to leave the factories, and to leave the mines for service in connection with the war.

Mr. BRISTOW rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. I wish the Senator from Kansas would let me finish this statement, and then I will yield to him.

Mr. BRISTOW. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. When the European war broke out it became apparent to every man who knew what the effect of withdrawing these 10,000,000 of men from productive enterprise and these additional 5,000,000 of men from production—in the aggregate 15,000,000 of able-bodied men—everybody knew what the effect of that would be upon the productive capacity of that continent; everybody knew that would be reflected in our imports from that continent.

In June we had a falling off in revenue, but it was the normal falling off that we had had during the fiscal year 1913-14. There was a falling off in that year, but the falling off of customs revenues in that year had been anticipated and provided for. We knew when we levied lower taxes that it meant less income to the customhouses, and also less taxation upon the people, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggests. As the result of those reduced duties upon imports we did lose in the fiscal year 1913-14 the sum of \$26,000,000; that is to say, our receipts from customs during that year were \$26,000,000 less than they were in the previous year.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand the Senator from North Carolina to say that he knew when the tariff law was passed that by reducing the duties we were going to get less revenue? Was it not the contention of the Senator and of others that by reducing duties we were going to get more importations and more revenue?

Mr. SIMMONS. We expected more importations; but as the duties were less, we expected less revenue. If the Senator from Michigan will get the report made by the committee at that time, he will see that we estimated for a reduction in revenue through the customhouses. We expected to get less revenue.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If I remember the Senator's argument, it was that it was expected to get more revenue—not by taking the duties off, but by reducing them.

Mr. SIMMONS. I can not hear the statement of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have stated that I am positive that certain Senators made the argument that by reducing the duties, not by taking them off, we were going to get more revenue; that there were certain things the importation of which was prohibited under the protective tariff, and that by reducing duties we were going to get more revenue by those articles coming into the United States.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know who the Senator from Michigan heard declare that. The Finance Committee, speaking through the majority members of that committee, did not make that declaration; no member of the Finance Committee nor any other Senator, so far as I know, declared any such thing. Of course, if the duties are reduced, there will be less money received from a given amount of importations.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And more goods imported?

Mr. SIMMONS. And we expected an increase of importations, but we did not expect the increase to be so large that it would equal the amount of the reduction from what we were receiving under the Payne-Aldrich law from customs revenues.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Then the argument—

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish. In our report we stated that on account of this reduction of tariff rates there would be a decrease in our customs revenues. We further declared that for the purpose of making up that decrease in customs revenues we had placed in that bill a provision taxing the incomes of the rich of this country, so that it would make up what we lost in our customs revenues.

As I have said, we did lose last year \$26,000,000 of customs revenues. That was the result of a reduction of duty; that was normal; that was expected. We did not lose quite so much as we had expected. As the Senator will see, if he will get the estimates then made, we thought the loss because of the reduction in duties would be larger than it turned out to be. As a matter of fact, the importations were somewhat larger than we had estimated and the reduction in revenues was somewhat less than we had estimated. That was the normal loss. Now, during three months and eight days, for which I have the figures—

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall be obliged to the Senator if he will allow me to finish this statement.

Mr. BRISTOW. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. For three months and eight days of the present fiscal year—I say "eight days," for I have not the figures showing the receipts later than the eighth day of this month—which have already expired, there has been a loss of revenue to the Government from the falling off of importations—I do not mean altogether importations from Europe, because our trade with other countries has been affected by the European war, as well as our trade with Europe; not to so great an extent, it is true, but it has been affected; there has been a falling off not only in importations from Europe but in importations from other countries—during the three months and eight days the falling off in our customs revenue has amounted to \$30,000,000 and something over, or \$4,000,000 more than we lost in customs duties under normal conditions during the entire fiscal year 1914.



Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator not to break in on this sentence, and I will conclude in a moment.

Leaving out the month of July, where there was no war, and taking the next two months and eight days of this year, August and September, when war conditions have prevailed, the falling off in customs receipts, resulting, of course, from the curtailment and reduction of imports, has amounted, in round numbers, to \$25,000,000, or in two months and eight days within \$1,000,000 as much as we lost under normal conditions during the entire fiscal year 1914.

I gave on Saturday last in the brief statement I then made to the Senate the falling off in revenue from customs for the first five days of the present month, October. My recollection now is that it amounted for those five days to \$2,800,000. I will not be quite sure about that; but that is my recollection. This morning I have been able to secure the returns for the first eight days of October, three days more than I had on Saturday, and I find that the falling off in revenues and customs during these eight days, resulting, of course, from the curtailment or falling off in imports, for it could not result from any other cause, amounts to \$5,050,000. So that during the last three days there has been a falling off in our revenues of \$2,400,000.

Mr. President, is this going to continue? I think it is going to continue, and I think it is going to get worse. When the war in Europe began there was the accumulated stock of goods for exportation. Immediately after the declaration of war, of course, when the embargo was on, there was a sudden falling off; and then, with the channels of ocean travel and commerce open again, there was naturally a spurt in exportations. The surplus which had been accumulated in time of peace, when the industries of that great manufacturing continent were at full blast, was hurried to market; and there was for a little while an unexpected arrival of goods on our shores, not coming up to the importations of August of last year by any means—a falling off of \$11,000,000 during that month—but the results were better than we have reason to expect they will be hereafter.

It is not going to be long before that accumulated stock of merchandise made for the purpose of exportation will have been sold, marketed, or consumed by the home demand. That that time has already begun to arrive to my mind is reflected by the fact that during the eight days of the present month there has been a very remarkable and a very sudden collapse of importations. I want to ask seriously, when this stock accumulated in times of peace has been marketed, where will the commodities for exportation from Europe be made? Where will they come from, Mr. President? The factories of France are practically closed; the factories of Germany are practically closed; the factories of Austria are practically closed; and the factories of England are partially closed. Will it not require all that the men and the women of those countries can produce in the field and all that the feeble who have stayed at home and escaped war duty can make in the factories and in the mines to supply the great demands of those countries and their armies, and where are the products to come from from which we are to receive revenues from imports?

In view of the fact that of our \$766,000,000 of dutiable imports in 1914, \$505,000,000 came from Europe, and the greater part of that \$505,000,000 came from the great industrial countries that are now engaged in armed conflict, where are the products to come from in Europe from which we are to get our revenues upon imports? If you suddenly cut off \$505,000,000 of our total dutiable imports of \$766,000,000, how can we expect to get more than one-third of our former revenue from customs? We are not expecting that all of the \$505,000,000 will be cut off; but it is expected, and reasonably expected, that the larger part of it will be cut off; and as it is cut off, of course, as a matter of necessity, we lose the revenue that we would normally derive from the tax imposed upon these imports.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to ask the Senator a question. In February last, as I remember, there was a falling off of \$10,000,000 in the revenues, as compared with the previous February. Does the Senator attribute that to the war in Europe?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not, Mr. President; but I say to the Senator, as everybody knows, that he has done what the leader of another body here did—he has picked out an exceptional month. You may pick out almost any month in any year and you will find, comparing it with that month of the last year, that there was either an increase or a falling off. They are

seldom ever the same. Sometimes for one reason and sometimes for another, the difference will be very considerable. But if the Senator will take the imports for the fiscal year 1914 he will find that the average falling off per month during that time was only about two and a half million dollars.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is, up to the 1st of October?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. Again—

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to say to the Senator right there, as an additional reason for this falling off in February—it did not occur to me at the moment, but my attention has been called to it—that wool went on the free list, as the Senator well knows, on the 1st day of March.

Mr. BRISTOW. No; I think it was the reduction in sugar. Wool went on the free list, as I remember it—

Mr. SIMMONS. Sugar; that is right.

Mr. GORE. It was the reduction in sugar.

Mr. BRISTOW. The reduction in sugar became effective on the 1st of March. Therefore there was a decline in the amount of sugar imported. The war had nothing to do with that, but the importers were waiting for the lower duty on sugar.

Now, let me inquire of the Senator if this great falling off in the revenues for the first eight days of October, 1914, as compared with the first eight days of October, 1913, is not largely due to the fact that there were in bond goods waiting for the new tariff bill to go into operation, when there was a reduction in duties, and that the increased importations in the first part of October, 1913, show this marked difference in the amount collected during the first eight days of October of this year and last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not exactly catch the point of the Senator.

Mr. BRISTOW. The bill that is now law became effective, as I remember, on the 4th day of October last.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. BRISTOW. And immediately there were very large importations of goods that were waiting to come in under the reduced rates, which showed a remarkable increase in the amount of duty collected for the first few days immediately after that bill became effective. Now, the Senator is taking this abnormal condition in 1913 and drawing a comparison with the importations this year, and as a result of that comparison he is concluding that the war in Europe is responsible for the difference, but he does not give a single fact that connects the war in Europe with this decline.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will ask the Senator if it needs any facts further than the fact of the decline, and further than the fact that there are no factories running to produce these things which heretofore have been imported into this country?

Mr. BRISTOW. There was a falling off in July of \$4,500,000 in our customs duties. That was before the war began. There is an average decline, from the 1st day of January down to the beginning of the war, of something over \$2,000,000 a month, as I remember. Now, why should the European war be suddenly responsible for this decline in revenues?

Mr. SIMMONS. I simply want to ask the Senator this question and then I will let the matter rest there:

We have heretofore been receiving, and did receive last year, two-thirds of all our dutiable imports from Europe. Does the Senator believe that in the condition that exists in the industrial countries of Europe to-day those countries are going to be, during this war, in a condition to send us the same amount of imports that they did in times of peace, when their factories were running and when their people were at work?

The Senator can answer that question, and that is all I desire to say to the Senator upon that subject.

Mr. BRISTOW. If the Senator will show specifically—and the figures ought to be available to him—that there is a decline in importation of dutiable products from the countries engaged in war aggregating a certain amount, and that the importations of such products have not been increased from the countries that are not at war, then he will have a basis upon which his allegations may stand; but until he presents—

Mr. SIMMONS. If the Senator will pardon me, I have just shown him that two-thirds of our imports come from Europe. I have just shown him that in eight days our revenues from imports have fallen off upward of \$5,000,000.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; in eight days; and that eight days includes the first four days of the operation of this law with the reduced duties. If the Senator has looked up the matter, he knows that those four days were probably the busiest days that the Customs Bureau of the Treasury Department ever had, because of the enormous storing of goods in bond waiting for the reduced duties. To make such a comparison now, and make that a basis for increased taxation, is unfair to the American



people, unjust and misleading; and it can not be made the basis for increased taxes to collect from the people \$100,000,000, which is not needed, according to the figures presented by the Senator himself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it is rather unusual for gentlemen to pretend to be more ignorant than they are. That sort of thing has just happened; but it seldom happens.

Of course the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow] knows, the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] knows, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Smith] knows that when, before this war began, we reduced tariff taxes we reduced them in two ways: First, by putting several things upon the free list—wool, to go into effect at a certain time; sugar, at another time; lumber, and various other things—and that the reduction of receipts to the Treasury took place immediately upon their going upon the free list; and of course each one of these Senators knows that we Democrats were not such fools as not to know that ourselves beforehand, when we framed the bills. Nobody ever imagined or even conceived, much less contended, that putting an article upon the free list was going to raise revenue. We contended simply that it was better, in the interests of the people, that the Government should do without that much revenue in order that the people might pay that much less tax—keep that much more of their hard-earned shekels in their pockets.

We reduced tariff taxation in another way, the second way referred to by me; that was by reducing the rates when we did not put articles upon the free list. In some cases where that was done the Treasury receipts were decreased, and in some cases where that was done the Treasury receipts were increased. Wherever the old rate was such that there was already a rather liberal importation, the decrease of the rate might lead, sometimes led, to a decrease of the Government revenue; but wherever the old rate had been so high as to be virtually prohibitive or even fairly in excess of a competitive point, then the decrease of the rate led, in the case of that particular article, to an increase of the customs receipts, thus accomplishing two beneficial results at the stroke of the pen—increasing the Government's revenues and decreasing the people's tax burdens. This is an ideal result of the "science of public wealth," which is a very good definition of political economy.

It is absurd for Senators to stand here arguing now as a fault against the Democratic Party that there was a reduction of customs receipts, when we announced to the whole world that that was exactly what we intended to have, and when we put upon the bill an income tax estimated to raise fifty millions per year for the purpose of making up for that very decrease. We would not have been foolish enough to have taxed men's incomes just for the pleasure of taxing their incomes, of course. All taxes are necessary evils. We taxed their incomes to make up the deficit in annual receipts which had been produced knowingly and deliberately and voluntarily by ourselves. We thought the wealthy could better afford to stand an income tax than all the people—the poor included—to stand a consumption tax.

When we came to consider the entire receipts—customs, internal revenue, income, all added together, of every description—we provided plenty of revenue. Senators must know it, and the report of the Ways and Means Committee and the statements of the Senator from North Carolina amply demonstrate it. But we were providing revenue only for normal times.

Now, Senators, come along to the abnormal condition. What is the abnormal condition? We pass out of the period of peace now, when we expected and experienced a reasonable and normal reduction in customs receipts, which we were making up for by other forms of taxation which, in our opinion, were more just and equitable and equal, and less discriminating, and come to an abnormal period of abnormal loss of customs receipts—a war time. We come now to the month of August, and I will take August and September and these first days of October as the three war months.

What was the reduction of revenue during the month of July, the month immediately preceding the war, as compared with July of the year previous? Why, Mr. President, it was \$4,818,000, in round numbers. If that decrease were calculated for the whole 12 months, it would have made about the fifty millions we had provided to lose on customs duties.

What was the reduction during the month of August, which was the first month of war? It was \$11,500,000, in round numbers—a little less than two and a half times as much as for July.

What was the reduction in customs revenue during the second war month—September? A little bit less than the previous month. Why? Because during August Great Britain opened the channels of oceanic trade and we began at least to receive importations from those countries which were neutral or which commanded the sea, and chiefly from Great Britain herself.

So in September nine and a half million dollars, in round numbers, was the reduction. Note that this is still twice the reduction of customs receipts we expected and experienced during July, the last peace month.

Then, when October came and the pressure began to be felt in the old countries and neutral ships no longer had any freight at all originating from poor, down-stricken, bedridden, and destroyed Belgium; scarcely any from France, invaded; from Germany, cut off by the British fleet from the commerce of the world; from Austria-Hungary, cut off by the British fleet from the commerce of the world; from Russia, virtually cut off from our commerce by the German fleet in the Baltic and the closure of the Bosphorus by Turkey—then we find that in the first eight days of that month the decreases of receipts were one million and a quarter dollars more than they were for the whole of the peace month of July, or \$5,050,044 for the former as compared with \$4,818,189 for the latter month.

But Senators needed no figures for this. Everybody knew this had to happen, or something very like this. The American people need no figures to demonstrate this natural, necessary consequence of a known great war factor. The American people are not fools, though sometimes, for a short while, they act like they were. Once, I remember, they were convinced that an American import or tariff tax law was passed 14 months after a world panic had caused the world panic; they were fools enough to let men whose interest it was to persuade them to believe this folly, to keep them persuaded of it for several years; and for a little while it did look, judging by that experience, as if they might be persuaded of any foolish proposition that it was to anybody's business or political interest to broach for popular consumption. They are now happily cured of that and some other like delusions. They are not such fools as to be persuaded by anybody, not even by the men who persuaded them of this other folly, that when all of Germany's varied products, all the things that "are made in Germany"—the German wines and the German beer, the German beet-root sugar, Nuremberg toys, German cloths and cutlery; everything that came to us from Germany—are cut off from us, except to the limited degree that we can yet find them stored up in neutral warehouses or bought by British and American consignees and not yet delivered, but deliverable soon after the war—when we are deprived of all that, that we could be deprived of it without a loss of revenue from taxes upon imports.

One of the very worst things about a tariff tax, one of the things which makes it the most unreliable of all taxes, one of the things which makes it that which no Government ought ever to resort to as a fiscal reliance, is that just when you need money most the tariff taxes fail. If you are thrown into a great war stress and strain for your own life, if the peoples who surround you are thrown into stress and strain to save their lives, then, just when your Government needs money most, imports fall off, rates remaining the same, and receipts at the Treasury become less. It is a tax upon which you can not rely except in times of peace and prosperity and industrial progress.

Let the Senator turn to the great annual reports of imports from little Belgium. Let him see how that busy little hive of industry made things that came to us every day across the sea. Then let him reflect that Louvain has been destroyed; that Antwerp has just been burned up and captured; that Brussels is held in the clutch of an enemy; that Ostend is threatened; that the great manufacturing town of Liege, from which we received so many things, has been stricken from the map! When the Senator remembers France, the wines of Burgundy and the wines of Bordeaux, the silks and the velvets, the faience articles, the many beautiful things upon which France impressed her taste and sent to the world, and chiefly to rich America, and when he remembers the condition she is in today, with her workingmen in the field, her cities being balloon bombed, her fields and factories devastated and burned, her peasantry driven away, her factory hands in arms, it surely should require no figures to tell the Senators from Kansas or from Utah or from Michigan why some of our importations had ceased and why some of the customs revenues had been cut off.

Then, if the Senators had but remembered the wines and the beers of Bohemia, the sparkling red wines of Hungary, the chemicals and the dyestuffs of Austria-Hungary as well as of Germany, and then if he had thought of the glassware and table plate and articles de luxe, as they are called, that are made in Vienna and imported into this country, and had remembered that there was a British fleet between them and the American market, he would not have had much occasion to demand that we resort to figures in order to know why and how and in what customs receipts would be knocked down very largely.



What are Senators trying to do? Here not long ago the aged Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] was sitting there in his place and something was said about this war, and I said, amongst other things, that I feared the time would come when men on that side of the Chamber might attempt to attribute some of these deficits in our trade and misfortunes caused by it to "the Democratic tariff bill." He shook his head in the negative, and I said I was glad to notice it. Now it is being done, not by him, however, who is your leader, but by others.

Of course this entire hundred million dollars is not required for the decreased collections of the months of August and September and these few days of October; but Lord Kitchener is of the opinion that the war will go on for three years. I know nothing about it, nor do the balance of us know anything about it. I think from the length of time that the Battle of the Aisne has lasted and the manner in which like bulldogs they fly at one another's throats and hold their grip and refuse to let loose, each man, whether Scotchman or Englishman or Welshman or Frenchman or Belgian, believing that the very life of their nation and their nationality and their civilization are at stake—little Belgium knowing that hers is, indeed has about been extinguished—we must agree that Lord Kitchener's estimate is not an unreasonable one. So, we have attempted to provide for what we think would be the deficit through an entire year, and it will not be astonishing if we shall after that have to provide more.

Mr. President, war is not like it used to be. In the old times when Napoleon went all over Europe with his army the army was what fought. Now, except in Great Britain and America, the whole people are levied en masse for the fight. In the old times Napoleon made France prosper during his wars by keeping all her industries at work, seeing that the workmen who had given France a reputation all over the world for articles of luxury and taste kept up the old French reputation, and these very French goods were smuggled to the English dutchesses and ladies of the court and to the American people at Baltimore and New York.

But to-day it is the people who go to war. It is not only the peasant in the field who goes, leaving his wife to take his place at the plow or the hoe. It is the workmen in the factories, and their wives and children must take their places or they must be left untaken and production paralyzed. It is the man who drives the Paris omnibus, and his wife is driving it now in his stead. So it is all over the world.

This is going to be worse, both for them and for us, than it is to-day, gentlemen. It is not without warning that the decrease in receipts for the first eight days in this month of October should be over half what it was for the whole month of September, and a million and more than what it was for the peace month of July. Notice how it is growing in geometrical proportion, a decrease amounting to over 50 per cent during the first eight days of October of that of the entire month of September. It is not a time for little quibbling about taxes.

Besides that, in a great, rich, prosperous country like this what do we, what have we, put these taxes on? We put them on your beer, for one thing. Who will pay it? It is doubtful if anybody will. The brewer will not. If he did, he is able to do it. He is the richest man in America, as a rule. If you go to Chicago, Buffalo, or New York, or anywhere, the first great villa that is pointed out to you is apt to be that of a brewer. If you ask whose it is, the answer is, "Mr. So-and-so's." "What is his business?" "He is a brewer." But he will not pay it. Who will pay it—the retail liquor dealer? No; he will do what he did during the Spanish-American War. He will simply put a little more froth, a little less beer, into a glass. Then you can take your choice. You can either consume less beer, and consuming less of it will hardly hurt you, or you can take a few more glasses in order to get your allotment of alcohol; and if so, in that case you, the consumer, will, it is true, pay it; but you will probably stick to your allotted number of glasses, costing you the same money, and burdening your stomach and bladder with less beer and more froth.

Is the slight tax upon rectified whisky going to hurt anybody anywhere particularly, except these great rectifiers, who are able to bear it and whose business, moreover, is not altogether healthful for the human nerves and stomach?

There is not an item in this revenue bill that is going to be burdensome by taxing a necessity of life or coming oppressively to bear on a poor man. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] was somewhat right when he said that Mr. Dingley had a very good head for levying taxes. When Mr. Dingley levied the war revenue of 1898 he levied perhaps one of the least oppressive war taxes ever levied. But I, at the other end of the Capitol, voted against it for one, because I thought there was a lot of

Government money that was out deposited in the banks at that time without interest which ought to be drawn in. I am opposed to drawing that money in now, because we are in a totally different condition.

The Spanish-American War, in so far as it was a disturbance of the American people or of American industries, was hardly a zephyr in a May month as compared with a December storm off the coast of Newfoundland. Except a few of our brave boys who were killed and wounded and the few who died in camp, it hardly meant anything to American life at all. The cotton men in one State in the South have suffered already in two months and less than a half more than all Americans suffered, financially and industrially, from the whole Spanish-American War.

Do gentlemen expect the American people to believe that there would not be a deficiency of revenue from importations during this time which threatens and impoverishes everybody abroad who ever sold us goods? Do gentlemen expect the American people to believe that, no matter what were the normal decreases of revenue from customs under our bill as compared with the revenues from customs under theirs, that this bill is not necessary because of the still further increase of reductions because of the war?

Gentlemen stand up here and say to the country, "This is a lie; this is but a pretense; it is not war revenue at all. It is a normal deficiency in a normal time owing to a bad Democratic law." Suppose you could prove that—folly and false both as it is—would it not be clearly still—and, indeed, a fortiori—our duty to go ahead and provide this revenue? But you can not prove it, because it is not true. Take the entire revenue from all sources, and we had enough annual revenue under our bill in normal times to provide for our revenue necessities in normal times. There were some of our new sources of revenue this year barely gotten into working order which will next year yield three or more times as much as they did this year—income taxes and other things.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] refers in touching words to the condition of Belgium, which, of course, appeals to all, and he cites that condition as an evidence that the importations to our country from Belgium have declined, which I am prepared, of course, to admit. The same is doubtless true as from Germany, and probably as from France; but what I have been endeavoring to get the authors of this bill to submit to the Senate is a statement showing the amount of the decline in importations from those countries engaged in the war, not any general, sentimental discussion of the conditions in Europe, horrible as they are. This is a revenue measure; this is a bill which proposes to levy a tax of more than \$100,000,000 on the American people upon the alleged ground that the war in Europe has resulted in that much of a decline in our revenues.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That it will result in that much.

Mr. BRISTOW. Yes; that it will result in that much. What I have been endeavoring to get submitted to the Senate is a statement of the amount of revenues so affected from the countries involved—a comparison between this year and previous years, so as to demonstrate whether the basis upon which the allegation is made is sound.

Then I call attention, again, to another feature of the condition of the Treasury, and that is that while there has been a marked decline in the amount collected upon importations there has been an increase in the amount collected from internal revenue, which to my mind demonstrates that while we may be importing less of the beer from Germany, to which the Senator from Mississippi referred, or less of the wines from France, the American consumer of these French and German products is using the products of his own country, and that is increasing the amount of taxes collected from internal revenue.

I should like for the Senator from North Carolina or any other member of the majority party, which is responsible for this measure, to submit to the Senate concrete and definite facts, not to indulge in sentimental and eloquent dissertations upon the condition in Europe. This is a practical question in finance. Let us know what has been our loss because of the war, as near as it can be intelligently ascertained, and then if we need additional taxes I will join with the Senators on the other side to levy them.

I will say in passing that I believe that what taxes are levied should be levied upon beer and alcoholic spirits. I believe it is an equitable tax. I believe it can be imposed with as little burden as any other kind of a tax. It is my opinion, if we can get definite and specific information, which is available, it will be found that all the taxes needed for the revenues that have been lost can be easily met by the taxes on the beer and

whiskies referred to by the Senator from Mississippi, and these other burdensome taxes will not be necessary to impose.

Mr. SIMMONS rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think if the Senator will—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield, and to whom?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield first to the Senator from Mississippi, and then to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think, in view of the interruption of our commerce, if this war tax is laid, the chances are we will have less money than we need rather than more.

Mr. BRISTOW. But I call the attention of the Senator to a fact he will at once recognize, that the amount of revenue collected last year during the first eight days of October was abnormally large, because it was on the 4th day of October that the tariff bill became effective, and the goods that had been stored in bond waiting for that law to become effective were then drawn out, and that resulted, as the Senator will remember, in a greater increased collection at that time.

To make a comparison of those days is not a fair comparison. It is better to make the comparison since the war began. The Senator will find, then, that there is not this abnormal increase, but that, as a matter of fact, since England has cleared the seas and all neutral commerce and commerce with England and France has been restored the decrease is not growing greater, but possibly less.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very frankly I will say there is some reason in the argument made by the Senator from Kansas as regards the first four days of the month of October and not the whole eight. It may be true that that particular eight days is a little bit out of keeping with what it would have been but for what happened before; but even if you discount that and allow for it, it still shows an immense decrease of revenue as compared with the month immediately preceding.

Mr. BRISTOW. I admit it shows a decrease, but the legitimate amount of the decrease that can be attributed to the war is what I am contending for. My contention is that we are undertaking to raise more revenue than is needed, more revenue than the facts demonstrate is needed, and that we can cut out a lot of these special taxes that are not necessary and that ought to be cut out.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator said a few moments ago that there had been an increase this year in internal-revenue taxes. I think in that statement the Senator is correct, so far as the tax upon whisky is concerned. There has been for the last month, probably for six weeks, a very considerable increase in the amount realized from the tax on whisky. The reason of that is very apparent. The whisky manufacturers anticipated that we would possibly impose a tax upon whisky and they at once began to draw whisky from the bonded warehouses. They have drawn during the last six weeks an abnormal amount of whisky from the warehouses. There has been an increase, as the Senator says, from that source; but there has been a very great decrease during the last two months in the internal-revenue taxes derived from beer. I do not know what the cause of that has been; but, as a matter of fact, there have been in the last two months a million and a half barrels less beer consumed than during the same period of time in the last fiscal year. So the loss from the beer tax and the gain from the whisky tax pretty much offset each other.

Mr. BRISTOW. But the Treasury Department's statement shows—

Mr. SIMMONS. A slight excess.

Mr. BRISTOW. I think something over \$9,000,000, was it not?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator is entirely mistaken about that; but I am not able to give the figures.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have not examined the figures.

Mr. SIMMONS. There has been an increase in whisky and there has been something over a million and a half decrease in beer.

Mr. BRISTOW. The statement of the Treasury Department shows that it is not as much as I thought, but it is an increase of approximately \$4,000,000 this year.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and a loss of a million and a half in beer.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not know what particular item the loss would be on.

Mr. SIMMONS. That was temporary; that was caused by the withdrawals in anticipation of a possible tax.

Mr. BRISTOW. That has been going on during the entire year. If the Senator will notice the Treasury statement month

by month, he will see that there has been a greater increase in the internal revenue collected.

Mr. SIMMONS. There has been for some years some increase in the receipts from internal revenue. I remember that we admitted that there would be an increase, because there had been a gradual increase for quite a number of years back.

I will say to the Senator that I have here a statement prepared for me by the actuary of the Treasury, giving an estimate of United States revenues from customs duties on European merchandise entering the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1915. He gives the revenues received last year from each of the countries of Europe and the estimated amount that will be received this year. He estimates that as against \$177,800,000 last year the receipts this year will be only \$71,870,000, making a total decrease of \$105,930,000.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator right there whether the actuary gives that by months?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; he merely gives it by the year.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. He does not give the figures, we will say, of the month of January of this year and of the month of January of last year?

Mr. SIMMONS. I can furnish the figures to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. That, I understand, is the whole gist of the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have already given the total loss actually sustained.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. But the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas is—I was very much interested in it, because I think it is very pertinent to the discussion of this bill—to find out what had been the decrease from each of the countries in Europe from which we get such large importations.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think I can get that. Those figures can be easily obtained from the Treasury.

As I have said, there have been decreases from probably other countries besides those of Europe, which are affected just as we are affected by the results of the war; but I think it will probably be an easy matter to segregate the figures from the European countries from the decrease from other countries, and I shall be very glad to do it.

Mr. BRISTOW. Of course it may take some time to get the information; but I want to call the Senator's attention to another condition. During the first month of the European war there was doubtless a decrease of exportations from England, because England's commerce was seriously interfered with; there was a general blockade; but after England's commerce had been restored to normal conditions, as it now is, that would not be the case. I was talking with a very large exporter today, who told me that they were suffering no inconvenience except in their exportations to Germany; that they could not get into Germany; but that their exportations to France and to England and their commerce with those countries was not now disturbed—that it was practically normal. So I think we should have a detailed statement, month by month, from each of the countries. In my opinion it would show that we are rapidly approaching normal commercial conditions with England, and possibly with France.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, there is not any question that England will become a great importer of products of other countries in order to supply her domestic demands, but that there will be no disturbance of English commerce and that there has not been up to this time is wholly unsustained by the facts and by reason.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in the report made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] from the Committee on Finance, in which he adopts the report of the House of Representatives upon this bill, I notice that the members of the committee on the part of the House claim—and the Senator reporting the bill has adopted their figures—that the estimated falling off of customs revenues during the next 12 months because of the European war is as follows:

*Estimated falling off in customs revenue during the next 12 months because of the European war.*

Countries.	Dutiable imports, value 1914.	Estimated falling off in revenues during next 12 months.
Austria-Hungary.....	\$15,232,645	\$5,267,000
Belgium.....	21,324,417	5,398,000
France.....	95,445,062	35,566,000
Germany.....	119,383,978	38,083,000
Russia in Europe.....	2,420,602	242,000
Servia and Montenegro.....	9,627	2,000
United Kingdom.....	132,173,220	40,653,000
Total.....	385,989,551	125,811,000



Now I turn to another part of this report, Mr. President—  
 Mr. SIMMONS. The countries whose names the Senator from Utah has read are countries engaged in war, but the Senator ought to read the notes in the report in which it is stated:

NOTE.—This estimate is made on the assumption that all imports from the European countries at war will cease during the next 12 months. The import values shown represent the dutiable articles imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914. The estimated falling off in revenue is computed by applying the rates of the act of 1913 to the imports for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, that does not change the point to which I wanted to call the attention of the Senate. The estimated falling off of the customs revenues during the next 12 months of the European war from those countries is, according to that estimate, \$125,811,000. On another page of the same report I find this statement:

The countries now at war comprise Austria-Hungary, Belgium, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, Serbia and Montenegro, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain. If it were not for war conditions and the amount of imports had remained the same as those of last year, the customs taxes levied by the present tariff act from said countries would have yielded \$133,079,000.

In other words, Mr. President, the proposition on which we are basing the advisability of the passage of this bill is that all of the revenue collected from all of the countries now engaged in war will cease and that we are not going to receive any revenue from those countries, with perhaps the exception of the difference between \$125,811,000 and \$133,079,000.

Mr. President, such a proposition is ridiculous; in fact, we have already received in the few months during which the war has been going on more than the estimate for the full 12 months. Is there any reason for seeking to impose a burden of \$100,000,000 upon the backs of the American people upon such a proposition? I think, Mr. President, it should not be done or even considered.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the Senator read the table, but failed to read the note which I have read, and then failed to read the next observation in the report, in which it is stated:

It must be borne in mind that the above estimates are based on the assumption that all imports from the countries at war will cease. It seems certain that the imports of some articles will continue and that the falling off in customs revenue will not be greater than \$100,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Well, Mr. President, in that connection—

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a moment; let me finish. I have just stated that the statement from which the Senator has read refers only to the seven countries now engaged in war in Europe. The estimate which I hold in my hand, and to which I referred a little while ago, refers to all of the countries of Europe, and from it, as I said a little while ago, it will appear that our revenues from imports from those countries last year were \$177,800,000. It is estimated that we will receive during this fiscal year from those countries about \$71,000,000.

Mr. SMOOT. This report does not so show, and I—

Mr. SIMMONS. It refers to only a part of the countries from which we receive imports.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator, that if all of the receipts from all of the countries engaged in war are entirely eliminated and not a dollar comes from them, there is not a country outside of the war zone that will not import more goods into the United States than they have imported in the past. China will do so, Japan will do so, and every country that has free access to the ocean will do so; and I say it is not right to load this burden of taxation upon the American people, especially upon the pretext that is being made for doing it. Why not come out openly and say that from now on the revenues will not be sufficient to pay for the enormous appropriations which have been made for the present fiscal year? Why not admit that, and why not cease to try to deceive the American people? You may deceive them temporarily, and you may be successful in doing so for a year or two, but the deception will come home to plague you just as surely as the sun will rise to-morrow morning.

Mr. SHEPPARD obtained the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, when the Senator from Utah says that we are simply levying this tax for the purpose of meeting the enormous appropriations that we have made this year, I want to say to him what I have said before, that the appropriations which were made last year were met by the receipts of our tariff law, and there was, besides, a surplus of \$34,000,000. The appropriations for this year, made up to this time—and I think we have about finished making appropriations—are only \$11,000,000 more than those made last year;

and hence there is no enormous appropriation to be met during the next fiscal year that we did not meet during the last fiscal year, when we had a surplus of \$34,000,000, after we had paid the amounts appropriated.

The Senator says, and I am amazed at his statement, that, instead of importations to this country falling off as a result of the war, they will increase. He says they will increase from China and that they will increase from Japan. The Senator knows that Japan, as well as England, is at war; the Senator knows that the industries of China are affected by the war, because the war is rapidly becoming one of invasion into the territory of China; the Senator knows that we are not the only country in the world that has been affected by the war; he knows that, as a result of the war, Brazil has had her industries prostrated.

Mr. KERN. And Switzerland.

Mr. SIMMONS. Brazil, thousands of miles away from the zone of war, has been affected worse than we have been affected. Her factories, such as she has, have closed to a large extent; moratoriums have been declared; interest has gone up in that country to 17 per cent; there is stagnation in business; and yet the Senator tells us, with the world affected, with industries crippled, with business stagnated, with finances deranged, that we may expect greater importations from those countries than we have had heretofore. I tell the Senator that there is going to be a falling off in importations to this country from most of the countries from which we have been receiving imports.

Mr. SMOOT. I have not said that there would not be.

Mr. SIMMONS. I tell the Senator that when he states here that, as a result of war conditions in Europe, there is not going to be a serious falling off in the revenue, amounting almost to a total cessation of revenues in the case of some countries in Europe, he is making a statement which the facts do not warrant.

Mr. SMOOT. I have made no such statement.

Mr. SIMMONS. I want to know how the Senator believes that it is possible for Belgium, in the condition described so eloquently and so forcefully by the Senator from Mississippi, to make and send us the \$42,000,000 of imports from which we have been receiving \$5,000,000 or \$6,000,000 annually through the customhouse?

Mr. SMOOT. Belgium is involved in the war.

Mr. SIMMONS. Belgium not involved in the war! Belgium, so far as her industries are concerned, Mr. President, is more affected by the war than any other country in Europe.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Utah said Belgium was involved in the war.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I misunderstood the Senator; I thought he said she was not involved in the war, and I was not particularly surprised when I understood the Senator to say that, because some of his other statements, I think, have been just about as far from the mark as that would have been.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Utah is a little more careful in his remarks in the Senate than is the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator may think so, but I do not think that is the judgment of other people. That is doubtless his judgment about the matter, and I will let him have his way about it. But, Mr. President, does the Senator mean to contend that we have a right to expect anything of consequence in the way of imports from France, a country from which we received last year imports amounting to \$141,000,000? Will the Senator tell the Senate who is going to produce the products which France sent us last year? Will the Senator tell us who is going to produce the products which Germany sent us last year? Will the Senator tell us who is going to produce the products which Austria and Russia sent us last year? Unless the factories of those countries are running, unless the production is in excess of the domestic demand, the Senator knows there will be no imports from those countries, and the Senator knows that under the conditions that they have there—exceptional, abnormal, unique in the history of the world, where nations are struggling for the fate of their empires, where every able-bodied man is called to arms, where nobody is left to run the factories except the women and the children—the Senator knows that under those conditions they will do well, and mighty well at that, if they succeed in making enough to supply their own demand, to say nothing about a surplus to send to the other countries of the world.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from North Carolina has built a straw man and then has proceeded to demolish him. The Senator from Utah was very particular in saying that the importations from countries not involved in war would increase; and every country that the Senator speaks of, with the exception



of Japan, is involved in war. There is no one who does not know that England is controlling the sea with her immense navy. There is no one who does not know that the shipping from England and France to the United States or to any other country is just as free as it was before war was declared. There is no one who does not know that the shipping of Japan is open. There is no one who does not know that she can ship to this country now, without molestation, anything that may be ordered from her by anyone in this country.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. SMOOT. In just a moment.

Mr. President, according to the report made by the committee the countries involved in this war shipped goods to this country from which there was a customs revenue of \$133,079,000, and I challenge any Senator here to say that there will not be more than \$8,000 revenue to this Government for 12 months from those countries. Any such statement will not be true, for it has already received more than that—many, many times more.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Will the Senator permit, just here—

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator will restrain his impatience for just a minute, I am going to take my seat.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I do not want to drive the Senator to his seat.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall not be five minutes more.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. All right.

Mr. SMOOT. I also want to say to the Senator that it is quarter to 6 now, and I have been speaking a good deal to-day, and I am a little tired.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I only wanted to say, just at this point—

Mr. SMOOT. I want to get through, and then the Senator can take whatever time he desires to take.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I have no desire to make any extended remarks on the matter. I simply wanted to correct a statement that the Senator made which I think was rather extravagant. He said that England was just as free to ship now as ever. I hold in my hand a statement published monthly by the National Banking Co., of Newark, N. J. They are considered great authority, and apropos of the particular remark of the Senator that England is just as free as ever to ship goods to this country, it says here:

The trade of every country in the world shows decreases. The figures for England, which have just come to hand, show a decrease in imports during August of this year of 24.3 per cent as compared with August of last year; and the exports of England for the same month show a decrease of 45.1 per cent as compared with last year.

So that England can not be just as free as ever to ship, and we can not receive imports if England can not export; and how, in God's name, are we to derive revenue under those circumstances?

Mr. SMOOT. The report from which the Senator has read was for the month of August.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. That was when the war first began; that was before England got her navy into action; that was before she had destroyed the merchant ships of Germany and of Austria; that was before she had driven from all the oceans of the world ships that were owned and controlled by her foes. But to-day is the 12th day of October, and I am really surprised that the Senator from New Jersey should say that there is the least danger in shipping a cargo from any port in the United States to any port in England.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I think if I were a shipper I would consider it quite dangerous to export a cargo, even in the face of the statement of the Senator from Utah. Shipping across the Atlantic is very different from shipping across the quiet waters of Salt Lake.

Mr. SMOOT. The business men are not alarmed about shipping goods to England, and there is no necessity for alarm, because England has bottled up the navies of Germany and Austria. As far as those navies are concerned, they might just as well be off of the ocean; and the shipping outside of the nations involved in the war is going on as usual. I do not say they are exporting as much. Of course, England would not export as much. I do not say England has imported as much. It would be nonsense for anyone even to think of such a thing. What I have said I say because the facts bear me out.

I do not want to make a single statement here that could be questioned in the least, and I am so careful of the figures I quote here that I am not content with having them submitted to me by a man in the Treasury Department. I do not use them until after I have checked every one of them myself. It may be, perhaps, with the mass of figures that are quoted here, that

even then there may sometimes be a statement that would need revising, but very, very seldom. If I can not defend the principles of my party with truth and with facts I shall never try to defend them.

I do not think it is necessary, at this late hour of the day, to say more upon this particular point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one word before the Senator sits down, if he will pardon me. I hope it is clear that the estimate made here by the House committee is that this bill will bring in one hundred millions, or perhaps a little less; and that the remarks at the bottom of the table, to which the Senator called attention, show that they first gave all of the duties collected upon imports from those several countries, and gave them at \$100,000,000, or whatever they were—

Mr. SMOOT. One hundred and twenty-five million dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One hundred and twenty-five million and something, and then added below: "But it is not expected that all imports from these countries will cease," and then they put their estimate at one hundred million. So they provide for a continuance of \$25,000,000 of duties, which would mean a continuance of about three times that amount in value of goods.

Mr. SMOOT. Why, certainly; and I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi that there have been more goods than that imported into the United States from those countries since the war began. So that the estimate was based upon 12 months; and I think the Senator from Mississippi will agree with me that the estimate there is not well taken, based upon the importations already made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator thus far—that the importations from these several countries, even after the war began, continued for a time, because many of the goods were in neutral storehouses. Many had been ordered and consigned and were en route and reached here; but I suppose they made the estimate upon the basis of the 12 months and upon the assumption that a little over one-quarter of the revenue would continue to be collected. At least that is what they say.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to ask if we can not take a vote upon the first section of the bill to-night?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not think there will be any question about it in the morning, but I should not like to suggest the absence of a quorum and take up that time to-night. I ask the Senator to lay the bill aside, and we will take it up the first thing in the morning.

#### THE COTTON INDUSTRY.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a letter from Hon. R. L. HENRY, addressed to Hon. William G. McAdoo, Secretary of the Treasury, acknowledging the receipt of his letter of October 9, and replying thereto, relative to relief for cotton growers in the South. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 12, 1914.

HON. WILLIAM G. MCADOO,  
Secretary of the Treasury, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 9.

1. In reply I still insist that you have the indisputable right under section 5153, Revised Statutes, to deposit public moneys in the national banks throughout the South in any manner you may deem "equitable" to the extent of the funds in your hands or that may be supplied by your congressional action. It would not, under the present law, be "inequitable" for you to deposit in the national banks of the cotton and tobacco States \$50,000,000 of the \$74,000,000 now due the Treasury.

You deposited \$50,000,000 for crop-moving purposes in the agricultural States last year and with justifiable pride flaunted the fact in the faces of the New York bankers, coupled with the statement that if said New York bankers menaced the money market you would cause \$500,000,000 additional under the Aldrich-Vreeland Act to be taken out by the banks in the Southern States to thwart the menaces of the bankers in money centers. You were right then, and you would be right again to pursue the same course even if you had to use the just and influential prestige of your high office to induce Congress to furnish you with all the public moneys you need for the present crisis, which far surpasses our difficulties last year.

I still maintain that if you will announce to the world in a ringing proclamation that as Secretary of the Treasury you propose to use the public moneys on hand and to be secured by prompt and adequate legislation, to the extent of any number of millions of dollars necessary for the purpose of saving our cotton crop from sacrifice, you will avert the calamity now overwhelming the South from the paralyzed market. Such an announcement by you and the President of the Republic will set at naught the greed and defiance of the spinners, bankers, and speculators in cotton. It will instantly revive our prostrated market throughout the earth.

2. You assert your disinclination to sell Panama Canal bonds or to issue additional United States notes. You doubt that you can sell Panama Canal bonds. Permit me to remind you that I now have in my hands a special rule to bring up for consideration the Alexander bill, "to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States," etc. And you not only request the immediate appropriation of \$10,000,000 from the Treasury, but in addition provide that you be allowed to call into requisition the acts authorizing Panama Canal bonds, and that you be empowered to "issue and sell or use for such purchase or construction" any of those bonds now available "to a total amount not to exceed



\$30,000,000." It will convince you, as well as the simplest mind, to merely state that if you can find purchasers of those bonds for the purchase of the Government merchant ships you can easily sell the same bonds to save our cotton crop already produced, and thus avert the impending bankruptcy hanging over the 30,000,000 of people in the South. The President and yourself have asked Congress to pass this ship-purchase bill. Hence I maintain that if you will come to Congress and urge that you be given power to sell Panama Canal bonds at a higher rate of interest, if necessary, and to issue "United States notes" in sufficient amounts to be deposited as "public moneys" in the banks of the South to save our cotton crop, already grown in this temporary war crisis brought on by the appalling conditions in Europe, you will find a quick response on our part. Will you do this to save our southern people through this feasible and perfectly constitutional plan? My deliberate judgment is again reiterated that you should not hesitate a moment.

Third. You further say, "Since the 1st of August there has been issued to the national banks in the Southern States, including Missouri and Maryland, \$68,000,000 of additional bank currency. The national banks in those States may, by complying with the law, receive \$151,443,000 of additional national bank currency." Then, after taking note of certain public deposits already in those States and additional national bank circulation issued since the beginning of the European war, you add: "And there is available to the national banks in the Southern States, upon their compliance with the law, additional national bank currency amounting in the aggregate to \$151,000,000."

Again permit me to suggest that all this "additional currency" has not reached the distressed cotton producer. You will instantly recall that you have just finished a brave fight against the banks for "hoarding" their currency and unjustly monopolizing it and preventing it from going into the hands of the farmers. You have admitted, and must again admit, that a very small per cent of this additional money reached the farmers. Hence it failed in its purpose. The banks "hoarded" it, and by defying your ambition to get it into the possession of the farmers diverted it from the intended course and used it in their own business. So even you are brought by logic and fact to the conviction that the Aldrich-Vreeland Act in this emergency has proved to be nothing less than a huge farce and comes dangerously near being a fraud on the rights of the people and the Government.

Fourth. Again you say, "Moreover, existing law authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to issue more than \$1,000,000,000 of currency to the national banks throughout the country." \* \* \* I am firmly convinced that neither additional nor unlimited issues of paper money will help the cotton planter. I am equally convinced that the inevitable inflation which such issues would cause would hurt him and hurt the country.

Permit me to redirect your attention to the fact that you charged several weeks ago that banks were "hoarding" this currency. You have been powerless under the present law to get it to those in distress and into the real hands for whom you intended it throughout the South. You know that much of it was shipped back to the money centers to liquidate debts there. It is quite evident that under our present law the banks seem to have the power to expand and contract the currency at their will, to fix prices, depress and inflate values, affect wages and all property; and yet with all this "inflation" pointed out in your letter to me the money has not reached the people in localities where it is to-day needed. Something is wrong with the law or system in this crisis, or you would have been able with your known courage and ability to drive some of this vast amount of boasted new currency into the hands of the cotton and tobacco farmers.

Undoubtedly you need help from Congress, and you should come and aid those of us in that body ambitious to do this work right. In order to secure "public moneys," that will certainly go into the depositories of the South, to become absolutely available to the farmers upon fixed conditions.

Yes; I think and deliberately reassert that you must issue Treasury notes or sell Panama Canal bonds or other bonds, or both, in order to get the money into the hands of the producers, through the instrumentality of the banks as fiscal agents, at a low rate of interest, upon terms and conditions fixed by law. If you do not do this, the banks will continue to defy and thwart your will; and you must agree they have been doing that for more than 60 days.

Fifth. Finally you present this point to me: "Is it wise to issue \$400,000,000 of Government bonds and greenbacks merely to lend on cotton? Tobacco, naval stores, copper, silver, lumber, and other things have been hurt by the European war. All have applied to the Treasury for relief. If we disregard every suffering interest except cotton and make it the sole beneficiary of governmental favor, what becomes of the Democratic principle, 'Equal rights for all, special privileges for none'?"

You must allow me here to mention the "direct loan" of \$1,400,000 you recently found and inspired for Tennessee. Perhaps I can afford to call it a "directed loan," and solve the very slender doubt in your favor, inasmuch as the papers indicated that you "directed" Senator LEA and Secretary Sneed to the National Park Bank, of New York City, where they could find \$1,400,000 available to take up the notes of the State of Tennessee after you had lodged in the hands of that bank the sum of \$400,000 of the "public moneys," besides other deposits going before this, so that these gentlemen would not find themselves at the end of a false rainbow when they walked through the doors of that bank and into its vaults. In old-fashioned parlance, those gentlemen, in their quest of funds for distressed Tennessee, through the good offices of almost magical financiering, "found the gold at the end of the rainbow." It was not a rainbow of hope, but one of reality. I see nothing wrong or dishonorable in this loan, so efficiently directed by you according to newspaper accounts now in my hand, coupled with your letter to Maj. E. B. Stahlman.

But, Mr. Secretary, you can never convince any reasonable intellect that there is the slightest difference between the principle of that "directed loan" to Tennessee and a direct—or directed—loan through the banks of the South, as fiscal agents of the Government, to the farmer on his cotton or tobacco, at a reasonable rate of interest, of public moneys, in accordance with conditions fixed by law. The Government has as much right to fix the conditions upon which it loans its public moneys as it has to authorize the banks to loan the same funds upon conditions to be fixed by the banks themselves. There is no chance for the Government to lose a penny on cotton and tobacco. They are produced, and will be in warehouses. The principle is the same, and since you have aided in exercising it for Tennessee to save her credit you can not dispute it with the farmers of the South when they beseech you to save their purchasing power and debt-paying power through the same means.

Hence my course is fixed, and I shall go forward and contend for legislation treating the farmers of the South as we have done with

Tennessee, with the Dayton banks during the great flood in Ohio, and as was done in New York during 1907, when over \$40,000,000 of public moneys were deposited with the banks to relieve the stock market and finance the needs of Wall Street speculators.

Our need is overshadowing and pressing. You should join us and help to get legislation to sell the Panama Canal bonds and issue United States notes. Restrain the banks, hold them in leash, and prevent their further inflation of the currency, which is not reaching the farmers this year.

With cordial regards, I am,

Sincerely, yours,

R. L. HENRY.

ALASKA COAL LANDS (S. DOC. NO. 599).

Mr. MYERS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to survey the lands of the United States in the Territory of Alaska known to be valuable for their deposits of coal, preference to be given first in favor of surveying lands within those areas commonly known as the Bering River, Matanuska, and Nenana coal fields, and thereafter to such areas or coal fields as lie tributary to establishments or existing or proposed rail or water transportation lines: *Provided*, That such surveys shall be executed in accordance with existing laws and rules and regulations governing the survey of public lands. There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000 for the purpose of making the surveys herein provided for, to continue available until expended: *Provided*, That any surveys heretofore made under the authority or by the approval of the Department of the Interior may be adopted and used for the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 2. That the President of the United States shall designate and reserve from use, location, sale, lease, or disposition not exceeding 5,120 acres of coal-bearing land in the Bering River field and not exceeding 7,680 acres of coal-bearing land in the Matanuska field, and not to exceed one-half of the other coal lands in Alaska: *Provided*, That the coal deposits in such reserved areas may be mined under the direction of the President when, in his opinion, the mining of such coal in such reserved areas, under the direction of the President, becomes necessary, by reason of an insufficient supply of coal at a reasonable price for the requirements of Government works, construction and operation of Government railroads, for the Navy, for national protection, or for relief from monopoly or oppressive conditions.

"SEC. 3. That the unreserved coal lands and coal deposits shall be divided by the Secretary of the Interior into leasing blocks or tracts of 40 acres each, or multiples thereof, and in such form as in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the most economical mining of the coal in such blocks, but in no case exceeding 2,560 acres in any one leasing block or tract; and thereafter the Secretary shall offer such blocks or tracts and the coal, lignite, and associated minerals therein for leasing, and may award leases thereof through advertisement, competitive bidding, or such other methods as he may by general regulations adopt, to any person above the age of 21 years who is a citizen of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation or municipality organized under the laws of the United States or of any State or Territory thereof: *Provided*, That a majority of the stock of such corporation shall at all times be owned and held by citizens of the United States: *And provided further*, That no railroad or common carrier shall be permitted to take or acquire through lease or permit under this act any coal or coal lands in excess of such area or quantity as may be required and used solely for its own use, and such limitation of use shall be expressed in all leases or permits issued to railroads or common carriers hereunder: *And provided further*, That any person, association, or corporation qualified to become a lessee under this act and owning any pending claim under the public-land laws to any coal lands in Alaska may, within one year from the passage of this act, enter into an arrangement with the Secretary of the Interior by which such claim shall be fully relinquished to the United States; and if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior the circumstances connected with such claim justify so doing, the moneys paid by the claimant or claimants to the United



States on account of such claim shall, by direction of the Secretary of the Interior, be returned and paid over to such person, association, or corporation as a consideration for such relinquishment.

"All claims of existing rights to any of such lands in which final proof has been submitted and which are now pending before the Commissioner of the General Land Office or the Secretary of the Interior for decision shall be adjudicated within one year from the passage of this act.

"SEC. 4. That a person, association, or corporation holding a lease of coal lands under this act may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, and through the same procedure and upon the same terms and conditions as in the case of an original lease under this act, secure a further or new lease covering additional lands contiguous to those embraced in the original lease, but in no event shall the total area embraced in such original and new leases exceed in the aggregate 2,560 acres.

"That upon satisfactory showing by any lessee to the Secretary of the Interior that all of the workable deposits of coal within a tract covered by his or its lease will be exhausted, worked out, or removed within three years thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior may, within his discretion, lease to such lessee an additional tract of land or coal deposits, which, including the coal area remaining in the original lease, shall not exceed 2,560 acres, through the same procedure and under the same competitive conditions as in case of an original lease.

"SEC. 5. That, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, lessees holding under leases small blocks or areas may consolidate their said leases or holdings so as to include in a single holding not to exceed 2,560 acres of contiguous lands.

"SEC. 6. That each lease shall be for such leasing block or tract of land as may be offered or applied for, not exceeding in area 2,560 acres of land, to be described by the subdivisions of the survey, and no person, association, or corporation, except as hereinafter provided, shall be permitted to take or hold any interest as a stockholder or otherwise in more than one such lease under this act, and any interest held in violation of this proviso shall be forfeited to the United States by appropriate proceedings instituted by the Attorney General for that purpose in any court of competent jurisdiction, except that any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for two years, and not longer, after its acquisition.

"SEC. 7. That any person who shall purchase, acquire, or hold any interest in two or more such leases, except as herein provided, or who shall knowingly purchase, acquire, or hold any stock in a corporation having an interest in two or more such leases, or who shall knowingly sell or transfer to one disqualified to purchase, or except as in this act specifically provided, disqualified to acquire, any such interest, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than three years and by a fine not exceeding \$1,000: *Provided*, That any such ownership and interest hereby forbidden which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held two years after its acquisition and not longer, and in case of minority or other disability such time as the court may decree.

"SEC. 8. That any director, trustee, officer, or agent of any corporation holding any interest in such a lease who shall, on behalf of such corporation, act in the purchase of any interest in another lease, or, who shall knowingly act on behalf of such corporation in the sale or transfer of any such interest in any lease held by such corporation to any corporation or individual holding any interest in any such a lease, except as herein provided, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be subject to imprisonment for a term of not exceeding three years and a fine of not exceeding \$1,000.

"SEC. 8a. If any of the lands or deposits leased under the provisions of this act shall be subleased, trusted, possessed, or controlled by any device permanently, temporarily, directly, indirectly, tacitly, or in any manner whatsoever, so that they form part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with consent of lessee, or form the subject of any contract or conspiracy in restraint of trade in the mining or selling of coal, entered into by the lessee, or of any holding of such lands by any individual, partnership, association, corporation, or control, in excess of 2,560 acres in the Territory of Alaska, the lease thereof shall be forfeited by appropriate court proceedings.

"SEC. 9. That for the privilege of mining and extracting and disposing of the coal in the lands covered by his lease the lessee shall pay to the United States such royalties as may be specified in the lease, which shall not be less than 2 cents per ton, due and payable at the end of each month succeeding that of the shipment of the coal from the mine, and an annual rental, pay-

able at the beginning of each year, on the lands covered by such lease, at the rate of 25 cents per acre for the first year thereafter, 50 cents per acre for the second, third, fourth, and fifth years, and \$1 per acre for each and every year thereafter during the continuance of the lease, except that such rental for any year shall be credited against the royalties as they accrue for that year. Leases may be for periods of not more than 50 years each, subject to renewal, on such terms and conditions as may be authorized by law at the time of such renewal. All net profits from operation of Government mines, and all royalties and rentals under leases as herein provided, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate and distinct fund to be applied to the reimbursement of the Government of the United States on account of any expenditures made in the construction of railroads in Alaska, and the excess shall be deposited in the fund known as the Alaska fund, established by the act of Congress of January 27, 1905, to be expended as provided in said last-mentioned act.

"SEC. 10. That in order to provide for the supply of strictly local and domestic needs for fuel the Secretary of the Interior may, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe in advance, issue to any applicant qualified under section 3 of this act a limited license or permit granting the right to prospect for, mine, and dispose of coal belonging to the United States on specified tracts not to exceed 10 acres to any one person or association of persons in any one coal field for a period of not exceeding 10 years, on such conditions not inconsistent with this act as in his opinion will safeguard the public interest, without payment of royalty for the coal mined or for the land occupied: *Provided*, That the acquisition or holding of a lease under the preceding sections of this act shall be no bar to the acquisition, holding, or operating under the limited license in this section permitted. And the holding of such a license shall be no bar to the acquisition or holding of such a lease or interest therein.

"SEC. 11. That any lease, entry, location, occupation, or use permitted under this act shall reserve to the Government of the United States the right to grant or use such easements in, over, through, or upon the land leased, entered, located, occupied, or used as may be necessary or appropriate to the working of the same or other coal lands by or under authority of the Government and for other purposes: *Provided*, That said Secretary, in his discretion, in making any lease under this act, may reserve to the United States the right to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of the surface of the lands embraced within such lease under existing law or laws hereafter enacted in so far as said surface is not necessary for use by the lessee in extracting and removing the deposits of coal therein. If such reservation is made, it shall be so determined before the offering of such lease.

"That the said Secretary during the life of the lease is authorized to issue such permits for easements herein provided to be reserved, and to permit the use of such other public lands in the Territory of Alaska as may be necessary for the construction and maintenance of coal washeries or other works incident to the mining or treatment of coal, which lands may be occupied and used jointly or severally by lessees or permittees, as may be determined by said Secretary.

"SEC. 12. That no lease issued under authority of this act shall be assigned or sublet except with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior. Each lease shall contain provisions for the purpose of insuring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of said property, and for the safety and welfare of the miners and for the prevention of undue waste, including a restriction of the workday to not exceeding eight hours in any one day for underground workers except in cases of emergency; provisions securing the workers complete freedom of purchase, requiring the payment of wages at least twice a month in lawful money of the United States, and providing proper rules and regulations to secure fair and just weighing or measurement of the coal mined by each miner, and such other provisions as are needed for the protection of the interests of the United States, for the prevention of monopoly, and for the safeguarding of the public welfare.

"SEC. 13. That the possession of any lessee of the land or coal deposits leased under this act for all purposes involving adverse claims to the leased property shall be deemed the possession of the United States, and for such purposes the lessee shall occupy the same relation to the property leased as if operated directly by the United States.

"SEC. 14. That any such lease may be forfeited and canceled by appropriate proceeding in a court of competent jurisdiction whenever the lessee fails to comply with any provision of the lease or of general regulations promulgated under this act; and the lease may provide for the enforcement of other appropriate remedies for breach of specified conditions thereof.



"SEC. 15. That on and after the approval of this act no lands in Alaska containing deposits of coal withdrawn from entry or sale shall be disposed of or acquired in any manner except as provided in this act: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not affect any proceeding now pending in the Department of the Interior, and any such proceeding may be carried to a final determination in said department notwithstanding the passage hereof: *Provided further*, That no lease shall be made, under the provisions hereof, of any land, a claim for which is pending in the Department of the Interior at the date of the passage of this act, until and unless such claim is finally disposed of by the department adversely to the claimant.

"SEC. 16. That all statements, representations, or reports required, unless otherwise specified, by the Secretary of the Interior under this act shall be upon oath and in such form and upon such blanks as the Secretary of the Interior may require, and any person making false oath, representation, or report shall be subject to punishment as for perjury.

"SEC. 17. That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe the necessary and proper rules and regulations and to do any and all things necessary to carry out and accomplish the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 18. That all acts and parts of acts in conflict herewith are hereby repealed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

H. L. MYERS,  
WM. H. THOMPSON,  
*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

SCOTT FERRIS,  
EDWARD T. TAYLOR,  
WM. L. LA FOLLETTE,  
*Managers on the part of the House.*

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the report go over until to-morrow, and that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be printed and lie on the table.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

#### RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m., Monday, October 12, 1914) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, October 13, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

#### NOMINATIONS.

*Executive nominations received by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 8), 1914.*

##### MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF PORTO RICO.

Antonio R. Barceló, of Porto Rico, vice Martin Travieso. Nominated for appointment as member of the Executive Council of Porto Rico, provided for in section 18 of the act of Congress approved April 12, 1900, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes."

##### CONSUL.

James C. Monaghan, of Bayonne, N. J., to be consul of the United States of America at Kingston, Jamaica, vice Thomas Willing Peters, resigned.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

###### CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

First Lieut. Glen E. Edgerton, Corps of Engineers, to be captain from October 2, 1914, vice Capt. Charles K. Rockwell, resigned October 1, 1914.

Second Lieut. Leo J. Dillow, Corps of Engineers, to be first lieutenant from October 2, 1914, vice First Lieut. Glen E. Edgerton, promoted.

###### COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

First Lieut. Jacob A. Mack, Coast Artillery Corps, to be captain from October 2, 1914, vice Capt. Harrison S. Kerrick, detached from his proper command.

Second Lieut. John P. McCaskey, jr., Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from October 2, 1914, vice First Lieut. Jacob A. Mack, promoted.

Second Lieut. Edward S. Harrison, Coast Artillery Corps, to be first lieutenant from October 5, 1914, vice First Lieut. Vir-

ginus E. Clark, detailed in the aviation section of the Signal Corps.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Jonas H. Holden to be a commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Lieut. Levin J. Wallace to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy from the 1st day of July, 1914.

Passed Asst. Surg. Wesley H. Rennie to be a surgeon in the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1913.

##### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 12 (legislative day of October 8), 1914.*

##### REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Thomas Jones, of Vale, Oreg., to be register of the land office at Vale, Oreg., vice Bruce R. Kester, term expired.

##### PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Commander Rufus Z. Johnston to be a commander.

The following-named assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps to be assistant surgeons:

Charles E. Treibly.

William W. Hargrave.

Charles S. Stephenson.

Roscoe M. Waterhouse.

Summerfield M. Taylor to be an assistant surgeon in the Medical Reserve Corps.

Paymaster Walter B. Izard to be a pay inspector.

##### POSTMASTERS.

##### MASSACHUSETTS.

Michael O. Haggerty, North Adams.

Frank I. Pierson, Leominster.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, October 12, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this beautiful day, token of Thy presence and continued care. For all the longings, hopes, and aspirations which fill our minds and hearts. Help us with renewed faith and confidence to work ever toward the higher ideals as we know them in Christ Jesus, that we may awake at last in the consciousness of our likeness to Thee and in fullness of joy hear the words, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." And we will ascribe all praises to Thee, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 10, 1914, was read.

##### CORRECTION OF A VOTE.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct the RECORD and the Journal. On page 6134 of the RECORD of April 1, 1914, I am recorded as not voting. I was present at that time and voted "yea."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made in the Journal and in the RECORD in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

There was no objection.

##### APPROVAL OF THE JOURNAL.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved.

The motion was agreed to.

##### COTTON.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to print in the RECORD a copy of my letter in reply to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury. A few days ago the Secretary of the Treasury caused to have printed in the RECORD, at the request of the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. HOLLIS, a letter to me upon the cotton and currency question, and I should like to have my reply appear in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing in the RECORD his reply to the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to say this: I have uniformly objected to this debate going on upon the cotton question. I had a request from the gen-

tleman sitting on the other side of the aisle on Saturday to print the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, and I told him that I should object to that and to all such propositions, because I believed the debate should be had here on the floor of the House, open to Members of the House, and for that reason I must object to this request.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. PAYNE. Very well.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object to this. I am sure he wants to uphold the dignity of the House. Inasmuch as the Senate has authorized the printing of the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury, it seems to me that a humble Member of the House ought to be permitted to print his reply, so that the membership may see his views. I am doing everything that I can to secure a vote and debate upon this question, and hope and believe that by to-morrow this matter can be presented to the House of Representatives for some sort of action. I am leaving nothing undone to bring it before the House, and if the gentleman will allow this reply to be inserted, I assure him that I will not abate my zeal in endeavoring to secure a vote. I only want my rights as a Member of the House protected. I do not think I ought to be deprived of that privilege.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] object.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, I do not object. I only reserved the right to object for the purpose of stating that I hope that no objection will be made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

ALASKA COAL LANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
October 8 (calendar day October 10), 1914.

Ordered, That the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the conference committee.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I wish to inquire whether or not the Chair holds that the Philippine bill takes precedence over District matters to-day?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Very well.

#### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The SPEAKER. Under the special rule the House will resolve itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18459, and in the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, with Mr. ADAIR in the chair.

The Clerk reported the bill by title.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MILLER. It is rather embarrassing for me to make this inquiry, Mr. Chairman. At the conclusion of the sitting of the committee on Saturday I had offered a motion to strike out a portion of the paragraph now being considered. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made a point of order against my amendment, claiming it was included in a previous motion to strike out made by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Without any adequate discussion or consideration of the precedents, the Chair sustained the point of order. My parliamentary inquiry is now whether or not the Chair is willing to have that matter discussed in order that the precedents may be presented, with a view to deciding whether or not it would be advisable to overrule the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The present occupant of the chair was not in the Chamber at that time—

Mr. MILLER. My embarrassment arises from that fact, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. But as the Chair is informed, the point of order was sustained by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MILLER. Without any consideration of the precedents, Mr. Chairman; we did not have time then to present them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the point of order was sustained.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I would like to ask the gentleman how many more amendments he has to this section?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I am frank to say that this is the only amendment which I had to the section, but since Saturday I have drafted a lot of them. I do not know that I shall offer any of them, but I have them.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I want to see if we can reach an agreement with the gentleman in some way. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, I thought the point of order was well taken.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be very pleased to discuss that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I do not care to argue it if we can save time otherwise. If we can save time and get away from this proposition, I would be willing to let the gentleman ask unanimous consent, as far as I am concerned, if the chairman of the committee will agree. If this is the only amendment the gentleman has to offer, that he should discuss it for five minutes and then we should vote on it.

Mr. MILLER. I would not be willing to make that kind of an agreement, although I would say to the gentleman I have no disposition to delay the bill at all, but I am firmly convinced the ruling of the Chair on Saturday was erroneous, and I think I can show it in two minutes by the precedents of the House and by the unquestionable parliamentary holdings. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to ask unanimous consent with that feature attached to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Minnesota that he understands the point of order was made and the point of order was sustained by the then Chairman of the committee, and so far as the present occupant of the chair is concerned that ends the matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much time does the gentleman desire to discuss this amendment? I understand there will be no other amendment to this section offered on this side. Perhaps the gentleman from Tennessee will agree to further extension of time in order to expedite the consideration of the bill. I understand this is the only amendment the gentleman proposes to offer.

Mr. MILLER. No; I would not want that to be understood.

Mr. BRYAN. No; I would not care to agree to that.

Mr. MILLER. I am not quite certain of my parliamentary situation, but I should imagine, inasmuch as that is the last act of the committee, if the Chair were so disposed, the Chair could open the discussion for further consideration of the point of order and change the Chair's position if he thought proper so to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would not feel warranted in setting aside the action of the former Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. I assumed that is true, and that is the unfortunate situation.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed for a moment—we are exceedingly anxious now to make progress upon this bill. I think everybody in the House understands why. There has been very liberal debate, under the five-minute rule; in fact there has been no attempt at any time, as I recall, to close debate, and it has not been closed at any time except by unanimous consent. I reiterate that I believed the point of order was well taken, and I felt like it was my duty to make the point of order, because I thought we ought to protect the bill, not because I had any objection to the proposition offered by the gentleman from Minnesota being voted upon by the House. Now, I should be willing myself to ask unanimous consent that the point of order be vacated and that it may be offered and voted upon if we can reach some reasonable agreement. I understand the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] wishes to offer an amendment other than the amendment which has been offered. Does the gentleman object to stating what the character of his amendment is—

Mr. BRYAN. No.



Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. So that we can proceed?

Mr. BRYAN. It is a phase of this suffrage proposition.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Of course I think the gentleman, if he has examined the precedents himself, will agree that that ruling was undoubtedly right.

Mr. BRYAN. I have nothing against that, and I am not going to raise any question on any ruling heretofore made.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I should be very glad if we can reach an agreement in order to save time.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman, after considering the matter since Saturday, I concluded that I have enough material to occupy about 10 minutes in presenting it. Now, I have one other amendment, which I do not care to discuss, but I am willing to offer it with possibly a moment of consideration.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman state what that amendment is?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; it was suggested to me by persons very much interested in the islands, and it provides that American citizens in the islands shall have the right to vote and hold office, but I would not care to enter upon a discussion of that.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That amendment would undoubtedly be in order.

Mr. MILLER. I have another amendment that, I think, is in order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do I understand that the gentleman wishes to offer three amendments?

Mr. MILLER. No; two.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is, the one offered the other day, excluded by the point of order, and this one?

Mr. MILLER. I am not particular about the one offered the other day. I have one that I think the committee will vote down, because it has been disposed to take that action.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Let us see if we can not reach an agreement. How much time will the gentleman from Washington desire in reference to this matter?

Mr. BRYAN. I shall only want five minutes. Five minutes is all I care for on my amendment, and I am willing to agree that I have that time.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 21 minutes, 11 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 21 minutes, 11 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], 5 minutes by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN], and 5 minutes by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

After the word "write," in line 4, page 12, insert "any section of this act in."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 4, after the word "write," insert the words "any section of this act in," so that the paragraph as amended will read:

"(c) Those who are able to read and write any section of this act in either Spanish, English, or a native language."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should really much prefer that the amendment should have been that which I offered the other day, namely, to strike out the words "or native language." I think the amendment was entirely in order, as sustained by the precedents of the House, but inasmuch as it was decided it was not in order, that ends it so far as that amendment is concerned. This amendment requires any person to possess the ability to read or write any section of this act either in English, Spanish, or native language. I am firmly of the opinion that the language employed in this act will open a Pandora's box in the Philippine Islands.

Now, I sincerely trust that no one will feel that I am in a critical attitude particularly, and certainly will not imagine that I am in any degree hostile to any of the ambitious or aspirations or desires of the Filipino people. I hope I shall never say anything or do anything that will be opposed to any of their legitimate aspirations. I am deeply in sympathy with most of them. But there are some facts associated with that which you are about to write into this act which you ought to know. I do not ask, Mr. Chairman, that you take my word for it. I am going to read to you, first and foremost, from a very distinguished Democrat, a gentleman who has had a great many years of experience in the islands, who has had many years' experience as a judge, and whose whole life and fortune

are wrapped up in the future welfare of the islands. This is what he says:

The words "or a native language" should be stricken from paragraph (c) of this section. The insertion of these words was obviously for the purpose of enlarging the electorate, and it would give in the election statistics a false appearance of literacy of the population. If this provision remains in the law it will result in qualifying as electors thousands of ignorant natives who will be managed, controlled, and voted in blocks by the petty politicians in the rural districts, as are now those electors qualifying under provisions of existing law exactly the same as those contained in paragraph (a) of section 15. Ninety per cent of the turmoil resulting from contested elections in this country, of which there are an astounding number, is due to this provision of the election law now in force. The great majority of men who qualify on account of having held petty municipal offices under the Spanish Government are ignorant and illiterate peasants who are herded to the polls like cattle at the will of the village bosses. As for being able to read and write a native language, thousands of natives have received sufficient instructions in the village schools to enable them to read after a fashion such simple literature as is printed in the various native dialects, and laboriously to write a little of their native language. This knowledge, to say the most for it, is about equivalent to that of a 6-year-old child in the United States of English, and carries with it nothing of real qualification for the suffrage. Under this extension of the franchise, local native election boards would, when it suited their purposes, give to it a liberal interpretation, permitting to qualify as electors hordes of ignorant natives with no conception of the rights and duties of citizenship, with absolutely no will of their own in public matters, and subject to the control of the worst class of politicians. It would make worse a situation already bad enough. As a matter of fact, there is not in this country to-day any such thing as real representative government, and most elections are the merest farces. President Wilson speaks of his "passion for the submerged 85 per cent" of the Mexican people. About 95 per cent is the figure in the Philippine Islands. These masses have not the faintest conception of republican government, no will or opinion as to public questions, and no means of expressing them if they had; and not until, after many years, the education of the children of the people now going forward as rapidly as possible has produced its effect will such a thing as republican government be possible in this country. I suppose that the pretense of popular government and playing at elections initiated under and continued by the past administration must be kept up, but let us be as sensible as possible about it and not make the farce still more ridiculous.

My only reason for inserting that is that it is from the viewpoint of a Democrat; a man who knows the facts. It is not that there shall be urged hostility to the Filipino people. It is to call attention to a great number of voters who will be enfranchised by this, but who are not now ready to assume the responsibilities of that franchise. The Filipino people are making remarkable progress, but give them a chance. Do not deluge them with political troubles while they are making this advance.

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman give us the name of the writer of that letter?

Mr. MILLER. I have not his permission to give it publicly, or I would be glad to do so. I would not care to place it in the RECORD without his sanction, and I have not his sanction.

Now, this is the opinion of a Republican:

The extension of the franchise to those who can read and write a native language would be disastrous. Probably 75 per cent of the present electorate is incapable of independent or intelligent voting, and the present scandalous practices in elections are due to the great proportion of ignorant and helpless voters. Obviously the class to be added would be of scant education and would increase the number of voters and lower the average capacity. With complaisant election officials almost every adult male could qualify, cacique rule would be more firmly established, and the party now in control of the machine would be fortified. It is very well to increase the number of voters if this can be done without lowering the standard; the schools are gradually adding educated voters, and it might be well to consider extending the franchise to women who can qualify by education or wealth. The character of the women of the Philippines and the position they now hold in society and in the family and even in business would make their enfranchisement reasonable and proper.

Now, the gentleman from Ohio some time ago made the statement, and he made it correctly, as I recall, so far as it went—I am referring to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON]—as to the literacy in the islands found by the census of 1903, but the statement standing by itself does not tell the whole story. I find in that report the following language:

Those who were able to read but not write numbered 1,208,845, which was 24.3 per cent, or a little less than one-quarter of all the inhabitants 10 years of age and over. Those able to both read and write numbered 1,002,588, and constituted 20.2 per cent, or about one-fifth of those who were at least 10 years of age. In this part of the population was included a small element who had received superior education. They numbered only 76,627, or 1.6 per cent of the population over 10 years of age.

I find in the report of the executive secretary, recently made, a comment pertinent and important, and I desire to read it at this point. In speaking of the elections and the difficulty they are having by reason of ignorant voters, he says:

Although the educational qualification for voting is not high—consisting only of ability to speak and write either English or Spanish—the proportion of electors shown to possess this degree of education, including the city of Manila, where 86 per cent were literate, was nearly, but not quite, one-third of those registered. In the Provinces alone but 30 per cent were educated. This lack of education required a large number of ballots to be prepared by the inspectors, a proceeding which opens the door to fraud and which is known to be one of the



chief reasons for the large number of protested elections, which was 240. The proportion of literate electors to the population in the territory affected was 1.47 per cent.

Now, it comes, Mr. Chairman, only from my sincere desire that we give to the people of the Philippine Islands an election law that will help them and not hurt them that I offer this amendment. They are progressing rapidly. The time is going to come when the percentage of literacy will be high and widespread. They are moving toward it rapidly and showing an eagerness for education most commendable; showing a development that should give them great national pride. But do not for any reason on earth put into the hands of this class of people a ballot which they do not know how to use.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes left.

Mr. MILLER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, when I shall have occupied two minutes I hope the Chair will call my attention to the fact.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary for me to repeat the arguments made by myself and others upon the subject of this amendment. It is not different in purpose and effect from the amendment just offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER]. If this amendment should be adopted, it certainly would not be in line with the liberal policy which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader on that side of the House, declared it to be his desire to follow in dealing with the Philippines. It would be exactly the reverse. It would restrict the right of suffrage to a far greater extent than this bill proposes to do.

I hope that no friend of the Filipinos, no one who wishes to give to them the fullest control over their affairs, consistent with American sovereignty, will vote for this amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I have only two minutes. I will say to the gentleman that if the Filipinos he would cut out of voting in the Philippines were to come to the United States and settle in his State and become naturalized citizens thereof—for I understand in his State they have manhood suffrage—they would be permitted to vote there. The gentleman would therefore permit Filipinos to vote in Minnesota without requiring of them any knowledge of English and would not permit them to vote in the Philippines unless they could read and write English. The very statement of this proposition demonstrates the absurdity of it. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MILLER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, yeas 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by adding a new section after line 5, page 12:

"That all citizens of the United States who can qualify under clauses A, B, and C of the preceding section, and who reside in the Philippine Islands, shall have the right to vote for all elective offices and the right to be chosen to fill any office in said islands."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the chairman if he is disposed to accept that?

Mr. JONES. I am not.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the chairman of the committee appreciates the very difficult position the American citizen will be in in the islands unless some such provision as that is accepted. This provision was brought to my attention very forcibly by people whose interests in the islands are very great. I certainly think an American citizen living in the islands, paying property tax and qualified in every way, ought to have the right to vote without renouncing his citizenship in the United States.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, just one minute. I am opposed to any man voting in the Philippine Islands who is not a citizen of the Philippines. I object to an American retaining his citizenship and his right to vote in the United States and at the same time exercising the right to vote in the Philippine Islands. I am as much opposed to an American doing this as I would be opposed to an Englishman or a German or a member of any other nationality doing it. It would be outrageous to permit such a provision as this. In my judgment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I want to occupy but one minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for just a word?

Mr. JONES. I have but two minutes in which to discuss the other amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer that amendment as a new paragraph in this section, to come in between lines 5 and 6. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 5, insert the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section except as to sex shall be eligible to vote in school elections and on all candidates for school director or other offices whose sole official function is connected with education."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have used one minute, because I have another amendment to offer. I merely want to state, so that every Member will understand, that this simply allows women to vote in school elections. We had that provision in the State of Washington before we gave universal suffrage to women, and I understand other States have that provision. A large number of the teachers in the Philippine Islands are women. Women are eligible to do the teaching, women are eligible to train the children, and why should they not be allowed to vote on problems affecting purely and simply elections of school directors and other similar officers. On such matters this limited and qualified suffrage ought by all means to be granted, and I think that if Congress, having already gone on record against universal suffrage, also goes on record against this qualified suffrage, it will take a step that is so remote and so resembles the cliff dwellers that Congress ought to be ashamed of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question being taken, the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, yeas 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 12, after line 5, insert the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section except as to sex shall be eligible to vote in all elections if she owns real property to the value of \$500 or annually pays \$30 or more of established taxes."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to be notified when I have used one minute.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make a point of order against that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. That is in effect precisely the same proposition which was offered on Saturday last and to which a point of order was sustained by the then occupant of the chair. There is no difference whatever in it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair wants to hear me on the point, I will say this amendment is different. This amendment takes up the matter of women voting who own property, just as the amendment preceding took up the question of women voting in school elections.

Now, for the Chair to rule that it is in order for us to take up amendments here as to various phases of citizenship, but because we have decided that universal suffrage shall be extended only to men that it is out of order for us to raise this question of qualified suffrage to women who own property, is, it seems to me, utterly illogical. The fact that some other occupant of the chair has made some other ruling in reference to some other amendment in some other place in the bill, does not make any difference. This Chairman certainly ought to be asked to make a ruling, simply because universal suffrage is extended only to males; that it is out of order to add a provision that when women own property they may vote; and while from the Democratic standpoint, while from the standpoint of the gentleman who has just spoken, it may be considered impolitic or a bad amendment, it certainly is in order for us to fix that qualification. Although the State of Louisiana, for instance, has a provision for male suffrage, it nevertheless has



a provision giving women who own property the right to vote on certain things.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] if he will send to the desk the amendment to which he refers, against which a point of order was sustained.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the Chair has before him the Record of the proceedings of Saturday last, it is in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the Record.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. On page 16439, at the top of the second column, is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN]. If the Chair will hear me a moment, I think I can state briefly the contention about it. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment providing for female suffrage in every instance coming within the provisions of this section where male suffrage is permitted. That opened up the entire question, and was voted down by the committee. That covered every phase of it.

Now, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] subsequently offered an amendment to one of these sections, which the Chair has before him, and that amendment appears at the top of page 16439. The point of order that I made against that amendment was that the exact proposition involved in his amendment has already been voted upon by the committee. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] had offered his amendment that was offered on Saturday, or if he had offered the amendment which he now offers, prior to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], it would not have made the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois out of order, because it was broader than that offered by the gentleman from Washington; but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois brought the whole question before the committee. It was voted upon and passed upon. If the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] can offer the amendment which he has just offered, then he can again open up another paragraph and nullify the complete proposition that was decided by the committee by the rejection of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. In other words, it is simply a repetition of that which the committee has already passed upon; and upon the theory that we must at some time, somewhere, be rid of these matters and make progress, I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], as stated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], was to extend the right of franchise to women of all classes; all women who could come in under class A; all women who could come in under class B, the property qualification clause; and all women who could come in under class C, the literacy qualification clause. It was a general, comprehensive amendment. That offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is very much less in extent. It contemplates extending the franchise to just one of the three classes.

I trust that I can get the point that I have in mind before the Chair. The amendment which the gentleman from Illinois offered extended the right of franchise to women of three classes. It was voted down. Now it is proposed to extend the right of franchise to one of the three classes. The query is, Does the previous action of the House in respect to all three classes prevent consideration of an amendment embracing one class? I would like to read to the Chair some comments of the patron saint of Democracy, Thomas Jefferson, in his Manual, on a situation precisely like this:

A motion is made to amend by striking out certain words and inserting others in their place, which is negatived. Then it is moved to strike out the same words and to insert others of a tenor entirely different from those first proposed. It is negatived. Then it is moved to strike out the same words and insert nothing, which is agreed to. All this is admissible, because to strike out and insert A is one proposition.

That is the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Illinois.

To strike out and insert B is a different proposition—

That is the proposition submitted by the gentleman from Washington—

and to strike out and insert nothing is still different. And the rejection of one proposition does not preclude the offering of a different one.

Now I find that precise question has been before the House or the committee and has been passed upon. Section 5769 of volume 5 of Hinds' Precedents reads as follows:

5769. A motion to strike out certain words being disagreed to, it is in order to strike out a portion of those words. On March 2, 1904, the District of Columbia appropriation bill was under consideration in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union when the following amendment was proposed and disagreed to:

"Strike out, in line 1, page 15, the words 'register of wills,' and in line 2 the words 'and the police court.'"

Thereupon Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH of Michigan moved to strike out the words "and the police court" in line 2.

Mr. Macenas E. Benton, of Missouri, suggested the point that the amendment had already been voted on.

The Chairman held:

"The Chair will remind the gentleman that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith] was to strike out the words 'register of wills' in the first line and the words 'and the police court' in the second line. No one called for a division. The proposition offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH] to strike out simply the words 'and the police court' is a different proposition. Perhaps it would have been better to have called for a division of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, but that was not done, and the Chair must hold that this is a different proposition—one which has not been acted upon. The question, then, is upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Again, in section 5570 it says:

It is in order to perfect words proposed to be stricken out by striking out a portion of them.

It seems to me very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the committee in disagreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois was one proposition, and this offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] is clearly another.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order for a moment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] may or not be important. That depends on one's point of view. But the question as to what shall be the rule of the House of Representatives with regard to amendments is certainly very important from everyone's standpoint. It is true that on Saturday the Chair made a certain ruling. My own impression is that the Chair had made his ruling before he clearly understood what the proposition was, and while the gentleman who then occupied the chair is an exceedingly fair man it is sometimes a little difficult, even for a Chairman, to adjust himself to new light that may come to him.

Now, this is the proposition, and it strikes me as being so clear and important that it would be a very great misfortune if we should establish a rule here which is certain to plague us in the future.

What is the situation? This bill has three sets of qualifications for electors—first, those who have held office; second, those who own property of a certain amount; third, those who are able to read and write. Now, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] favored allowing women of all these classes to vote. The committee voted down that proposition. The committee might have been in favor of allowing women who had formerly held office to vote; they might have been in favor of women owning property to vote; a majority of the committee might have been in favor of allowing women who are educated to vote. The committee might be in favor of one or two of these propositions and yet not be willing to allow all three classes of women to vote.

Now, if we are to hold that a blanket amendment, if offered, precludes all separate amendments on different propositions, this is what is likely to occur: Some one opposed to any amendment whatever may rise and offer a blanket amendment, realizing or believing or hoping or expecting that the blanket amendment will be voted down, and by so doing prevent the committee from exercising its judgment and expressing its opinion with regard to one or more clear and concrete propositions included in the amendment.

We certainly do not want to establish that sort of a situation in the House. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] does not desire it any more than the balance of us do. The object of the rule is to give the House an opportunity to express its opinion. The gentleman from Tennessee says if you allow this, then there is no end to the amendments that may be offered. Oh, yes; there is; and the end is well in sight. There are three different propositions. A general amendment could be offered covering them all, and then, from my view of the matter, it would be permissible to offer three other amendments covering each one of these classes; and that is the end of it; and that is not so long and wearisome a road that we need be disturbed about traveling it if we desire to give the committee an opportunity to express its opinion or its view.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] has already offered two amendments, so far as that is concerned; but does not the gentleman conceive that in its ultimate effect it would bring the committee to vote twice upon precisely the same question?

Mr. MONDELL. Not at all; and I think the Chair will have no difficulty in understanding the propositions involved. It is proper to offer a general amendment, covering a variety of



conditions, and certainly the offering of such an amendment should not preclude the offering of amendments that cover only part of the subject matter covered by the general amendment. I have already called the attention of the Chair to the effect of such a holding. It would give some one opposed to any amendment an opportunity to offer a general blanket amendment, and thus defeat the will of the committee.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. BRYAN. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it is impossible to word a special amendment affecting one of these particular subdivisions or classes so that you can insert it in this first paragraph, where the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] sought to amend. Here it says "every male citizen," and so forth, and you can not put a specific amendment in there ahead of the classes A, B, C and do it so that it will be intelligent. The specification for qualified suffrage must be put after the first paragraph, whether the specification refers to man suffrage or woman suffrage.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has suggested that had the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] offered his amendment first, a specific amendment covering but one class, then the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] might have offered a general amendment following that. By what curious process of reasoning the gentleman arrives at that conclusion and then insists that you can not turn the thing the other way around, I can not understand. Of course the amendment referring to one particular class could have been offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and another amendment referring to another class might have been offered by him or some one else, and another amendment referring to another class might have been offered by some one else. Those three amendments would have covered the whole ground, and then a general amendment perhaps would not have been in order, although there may be some question about that.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. JONES. I would like to ask the gentleman if, when the general amendment was offered to which he refers, it would not have been perfectly competent for either the gentleman from Washington or the gentleman from Minnesota to have asked that that be divided and that each proposition be voted upon separately; and if that was done, would not his object have been accomplished?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not think a demand for a division could have been made, because as presented it was not divisible. Possibly it could have been amended in a way to cover only one or taking in two classes, in which event certainly another amendment could have been offered that would have taken in the other class or the other two classes or a general amendment. Mr. Chairman, it is very dangerous, and would establish a rule that we would all regret—a rule that would rise to plague us many times in the future—if it were held and became the rule of the House that a general amendment could be offered covering a variety of subjects, and then no specific amendment covering a portion of the subject, or one feature of the subject, could thereafter be offered. It would be very easy for a designing person to prevent amendments and prevent the committee from expressing its view and opinion by doing that very thing.

Mr. BRYAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois was to strike out the word "male"; and if somebody wise in procedure will tell me how to divide that, I will learn something.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, clearly that amendment would not have been divisible on any theory of parliamentary law with which we are acquainted. Perhaps the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] could give us some explanation of how it could be done.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to me. The gentleman himself spoke of a general amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], and I submit that that was subject to a division.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we are talking now about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The present occupant of the chair has proven himself in other days worthy and qualified to pass judgment intelligently upon these subjects. I am sure that he is well qualified to pass upon this subject, and I am taking the time of the Chair because of the fact that this is an exceedingly important proposition. It is not a matter that may be decided one way or the other without seriously affecting the business of the House. It is a matter that is far-reaching; and a decision such as is suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee would place us in a

position where the hands of the committee would be tied. The opportunity of the committee to express its opinion would be prevented. Rather than have that condition arise, we might better spend a few moments discussing and voting upon various amendments.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair has the bill before him and will turn to page 11, line 15, he will see the language of the bill—

Every male citizen of the Philippines 21 years of age—

And so forth.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] offered an amendment at that point to strike out the word "male," so that it would then have read:

Every citizen of the Philippines—

And so forth.

Now, in the nature of the case, every citizen must be either male or female, and the whole is equal to and includes all of its parts, and therefore the committee in its wisdom, having voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], thereby in effect says that female suffrage in the Philippine Islands will not be permitted or authorized by this bill.

Mr. BRYAN. The committee did not say that.

Mr. HELM. Yes, it did. The effect of the Mann amendment was that every female over 21 years of age, who has resided in the Philippine Islands for one year and in the municipality for six months, and possessing the qualifications set forth in subsections a, b, and c should be permitted to vote.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right; that is what Mr. MANN proposed, and the committee said that everyone and every kind shall not be permitted—

Mr. HELM. I did not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BRYAN. But it did not say that a certain kind should not be permitted to vote.

Mr. HELM. The Mann amendment said, in effect—I will repeat it—that every female in the Philippine Islands over 21 years of age possessing the qualifications mentioned in sections 15 and embraced in subsections a, b, and c should be permitted to vote.

Mr. BRYAN. That is right.

Mr. HELM. The committee voted that down. And, now, how can you come back and say that some woman of the Caucasian race or some woman who pays \$15 taxes or some woman who has held an office or some woman who reads and writes the Spanish language shall be permitted to vote?

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. In just a moment.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will put in there, under all sections; but the committee has not expressed—

Mr. HELM. The committee is on record as being opposed to female suffrage in the Philippine Islands—

Mr. MONDELL. As a whole.

Mr. HELM. (continuing). No matter whether the woman pays \$15 taxes, no matter whether she can read and write Spanish or read and write English or whether she can read or write a native language or whether she has been one of those Spanish officers, whose names I can not pronounce—every one has been excluded.

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman will allow me. What the committee has done is to vote down an amendment giving universal suffrage, but the committee has not expressed itself on the question of limiting suffrage at all.

Mr. HELM. It has excluded every one of them.

Mr. MONDELL. That is what I wanted to call the attention of the chairman to—

Mr. HELM. The committee says woman suffrage shall not prevail in the Philippine Islands. How can you now, in the name of common sense, say any particular kind of woman shall vote? Now, just one other word. The regular chairman of this committee has gone on record after this matter has been argued as fully and as thoroughly and as completely as it has been argued here, and if we are going to continue this merry-go-round, one day riding the pony and the next day the sleigh, around and around, we will never get anywhere, and in the interest of business and in the interest of orderly procedure I think it ought to be disposed of without any further waste of time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] provided that all women included in all of the sections of the bill should have the right to vote in the Philippine Islands. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] provides that certain women owning so much property or paying so much taxes shall be permitted to vote. The Mann



amendment covered all women in the Philippine Islands, those owning property as well as those not owning property, those who do not pay taxes as well as those who do pay taxes, and in view of the fact that the Mann amendment covered all women in the Philippine Islands, it is perfectly clear in the opinion of the Chair that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington is not in order, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment. There is only one minute's debate on that amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chair if all time under the agreement has not been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has two minutes and the gentleman from Virginia has two minutes.

Mr. BRYAN. I have only used one minute. I have not spoken except on the first amendment and since then except on the point of order. I have four minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Did not the gentleman offer two amendments?

Mr. BRYAN. I offered two amendments, but was not permitted to debate the second one at all. The point of order was raised on it before I spoke a second. If I had been permitted to speak on it, it would have been too late to make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that he is mistaken. The gentleman is entitled to four minutes. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert as a new paragraph in section 15, between lines 5 and 6 on page 12, the following:

"Every female citizen qualified for suffrage under this section, except as to sex, shall be eligible to vote on all propositions submitted to the people on the incurring of indebtedness or the issuance of bonds if she owns real property to the value of \$500 or annually pays \$30 or more of established taxes."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be notified when I have used one minute. This amendment provides for the voting of women who own property only on questions of bonded indebtedness and on the incurring of indebtedness. You have provided that a man can ride in there on a horse, or a donkey, or anything else, and if he pays \$15 tax on that particular property he can vote, but a woman, no matter how much property she owns, can not vote; and you say it is out of order to think about it. You would not permit an amendment, so absurd from your viewpoint, to be even considered. It is ruled out of order.

Now, this proposition is that at a special election on a matter of bonds, or the incurring of indebtedness which would tax the property of a woman for which the authority of the electorate is necessary, in such a case the woman owning the property possessing all the qualifications for suffrage except that she is a woman, may, notwithstanding that impediment, be allowed to vote. That certainly is a right that ought to be recognized. It was adopted in Louisiana over 10 years ago, I know. The women who own property and pay taxes vote on the question of the issuance of bonds down there, and in any civilized community you should not tax a woman and then refuse to let her vote as to whether or not her property shall be taxed, in a special election held for the very purpose of determining whether such unusual indebtedness shall be incurred and such bonds be issued.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 9, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRYAN. Now, I have one more amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, as a new paragraph to section 15, after line 5, on page 12, the following:

"The Philippine Legislature is hereby authorized to extend the right of suffrage to female citizens at any time hereafter."

Mr. BRYAN. Now, Mr. Chairman, you say that this bill is designed to give the Filipino independence. You say that you are going to let the Filipino govern himself and you are going to open the door to removal of the jurisdiction of the United States. But you have a provision here that even though every member of the Philippine Legislature should want to pass a law letting women vote where they own property, letting women vote in school elections where women do most of the teaching, letting women vote on bond issues where they own property, and under various other conditions, or letting them have universal suffrage, even if every gentleman is like the distinguished gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON], and all

members of the legislature like him favor the women in this matter, nevertheless the strong hand of the United States Government comes down and says, "No; you shall not permit the women to vote under any conditions in the islands, notwithstanding the fact that we boast about giving you independence, notwithstanding that we boast about giving you liberty. Have we not mothers? Do we not know that women voting will disturb the conditions over there? Have we not mothers and wives and sisters, and do we not know that women voting will promote immorality in the islands? Have we not observed the female characteristics, and do you suppose that we are going to allow you to permit women to disturb your political conditions and infuse immorality into your politics? No; we will not permit it! What do women know about education? What do women know about taxation, even if they do own the property? We want you to have self-government, but we will never permit you to bring such a calamity down on your heads as would come to all your institutions from permitting your wives and mothers and sisters to vote. Never!"

I hope this committee will come to their senses on this thing. Every one of these votes, including the one for universal suffrage, have been characterized by this feature, that the Democratic side of the aisle is the only side where that kind of votes can be had, and we have a demonstration in this Congress to the effect that there is only one party that stands practically unanimous against the mothers and the wives and the sisters, so far as political rights are concerned. [Applause.]

You have not only gone on record against votes for women in the Philippines on the same terms as men, but you have voted against permitting taxpaying women to vote merely at special elections where no subject is up for consideration except "Shall we vote bonds and extra taxes," for railroad help, for waterworks, for light plant, or other public works. A man may be drunk and a pauper, but he can vote, if he can read or ever held an office; but a woman may own her home and a substantial business, and may have been a college teacher the greater part of her life, and she can not vote even as to taxes. Ignorant men may vote on school elections and school bonds; but the very teachers themselves, who are women (and most of them are), can not vote even at a school election. Mothers and widows can not vote at school elections.

Then you go further, and say that you will not permit the Philippine Legislature to grant any kind of qualified suffrage to any woman at any time, even if every member of the legislature desires such legislation. You tie the legislature's hands by making it impossible for the insane, the criminals, and women to vote. What becomes of your State-rights talk. Here you deny it as a right of the Filipino to determine this matter, although you allow him to determine very nearly every phase of local government.

The Democratic Party is an enemy of woman suffrage in the State, in the Nation, in the islands, anywhere and everywhere. You will be the only party in the next presidential campaign whose platform does not contain a plank for equal suffrage. I am in hearty sympathy with the movement of the Congressional Union to hold the party responsible in the 10—soon to be 14—suffrage States for this. No individual is responsible; it is a great party that is blocking the way to equal suffrage, and I congratulate Miss Paul, of the Congressional Union, for locating the trouble. Suffrage workers in the suffrage States should apply the remedy.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss this question. Almost the whole of Saturday was occupied in discussing the suffrage matter, but I do wish to say to the gentleman who has just spoken that it does not lie in the mouth of any gentleman on that side who has assailed this bill to charge the Democrats—those who favor it—with inconsistency. I think the gentleman himself voted to restrict the suffrage in the Philippine Islands to those who could read or write English or Spanish. After having cast that vote, it does not lie in the gentleman's mouth to talk about the Democrats not being liberal toward the Philippines.

Mr. BRYAN. I was talking about the liberty of the women.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN].

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division in order to see where they stand up.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 11, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16. That for the purposes of the first election hereafter to the Philippine Legislature, the Philippine Islands shall be divided by the

Philippine Commission into 12 senate and ninety representative districts. In establishing senate and representative districts the commission shall establish in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly one senate and nine representative districts. The first election hereafter shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1915, and there shall be chosen at such election senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature: *Provided*, That the Governor General of the Philippine Islands shall appoint, without the consent of the senate and without restriction as to residence, senators and representatives who will, in his opinion, best represent the senate district and those representative districts which may be included in the territory not now represented in the Philippine Assembly: *Provided further*, That thereafter elections shall be held only on such days and under such regulations as to ballots, voting, and qualifications of electors as may be prescribed by the Philippine Legislature, to which is hereby given authority to redistrict the Philippine Islands and modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. TOWNER: Page 12, line 13, after the word "districts," strike out all the remainder of the line, all of line 14, all of line 15, all of line 16 down to and including the word "Legislature," and insert in lieu thereof "The first election under the provisions of this act shall be held on the first Tuesday of June, 1915, and there shall be chosen at such election one senator from each senate district for a term of three years and one for six years. Thereafter one senator from each district shall be elected from each senate district for a term of six years. That at said first election each representative district shall elect one representative for a term of three years, and triennially thereafter."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to move that the committee do now rise in order to get in a formal matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ADAIR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEASING OF COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further conference asked by the Senate on the Alaskan coal bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, be agreed to, and that two new conferees be appointed in lieu of the two that are absent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks unanimous consent that the House agree to the conference asked by the Senate on House bill 14233, and that new conferees be appointed on account of the absence of two conferees.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the precedents, I believe the bill is still in conference, and if it were not for the absence of two of the House conferees, the House conferees could proceed with this matter without any action on the part of the House. I wish to be advised by the Speaker if that is not the ruling of Speaker Cannon?

The SPEAKER. Which side has the papers?

Mr. FERRIS. The Senate.

The SPEAKER. The House can not do anything in regard to the conference until the Senate gets through with the papers. It may be that the first half of the gentleman's request is surplusage, but the last half is necessary because two of the conferees have gone away.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understood from the proceedings that the conference report was rejected in the Senate on a point of order.

The SPEAKER. It was rejected by the Senate, and the Senate asked for a new conference. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] asks that we agree to the request of the Senate for a new conference, and the Chair will appoint the new conferees. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair will appoint the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. Under the special rule the House resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 18459, with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] in the chair.

#### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is again in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill 18459—the Philippine bill.

Mr. TOWNER. The amendment I offered, Mr. Chairman, is merely a perfection or continuation of the amendment which was discussed the other day with regard to the election of senators and representatives, making the term of senators six years, forming a continuous senate, electing one-half of them every three years, and fixing the term of members of the assembly at three years.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] assures me that that is the amendment we agreed upon, and I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TOWNER:

"Page 12, line 16, after the word 'Legislature,' strike out the remainder of line 16, all of line 17, all of line 18, all of line 19, all of line 20, all of line 21, all of line 22, and the words 'Philippine Assembly' in line 23, and insert, at the end of the section, as a new section, to be numbered '16a'."

Mr. HELM. I will ask the gentleman where that amendment is inserted in the bill?

Mr. TOWNER. It is to strike out the provision for the representation of the inhabitants of non-Christian territory. I will say to the gentleman, and to insert the provision which I introduced in the committee for a commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not reported the real amendment yet that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] intended to offer. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 16a. That the provisions of this bill shall not be applied to the territory occupied by nor to the people known as the Moros or other non-Christian tribes. That such peoples and non-Christian tribes shall be allowed to maintain their tribal organization and government subject to the provisions of this section. That the government of the territory now occupied by the said Moros and other non-Christian tribes and of said peoples is hereby committed to a commission to be known as the Philippine Commission, to consist of three persons to be appointed by the President by and with the approval of the Senate of the United States and the Governor General or Acting Governor General of the Philippines. That said three members so appointed shall receive a salary of \$5,000 each, and shall hold their offices for four years and until their successors are appointed and qualified. That said commission shall have such powers in general, except as modified by existing conditions, as were granted to the commission appointed by the President of the United States by the order of April 7, 1900. That said commission shall have power to transfer from time to time such territory and peoples to the government and jurisdiction of the Philippine Government, as provided for in the preceding sections of this act, by and with the consent of the Philippine Legislature. That any tribe or people of such Moros or other non-Christian tribes, sufficient in number and of such contiguous residence as to constitute an entity capable of municipal organization which shall desire to be admitted to the jurisdiction of the Philippine Government established in preceding sections of this act, and who shall present a petition, signed by a majority of the males over 21 years of age of such tribe or entity, to that effect to the Philippine Legislature, may be admitted upon the acceptance of the transfer or jurisdiction by the Philippine Legislature and the approval of the President of the United States. The right to amend, modify, or repeal this section is hereby reserved to Congress without in any way affecting the other provisions of this act.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the gentleman if we can not agree to some little time for debate on the proposition?

Mr. TOWNER. Does the gentleman think 10 minutes would be sufficient?

Mr. JONES. I think that would be sufficient for me, but other gentleman on this side will want time. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] want time on this question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. This is one of the most important paragraphs, if not perhaps the most important paragraph, in the entire bill. This is one, and coupled with it there is one that deals with a kindred subject, namely, the government of the non-Christian tribes, and it ought to be discussed at some considerable length.

Mr. JONES. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask that the debate on this subject be limited to 20 minutes.



Mr. MILLER. On this particular amendment alone?

Mr. JONES. Yes. There will be another one.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not know anything about that.

Mr. MILLER. Make it 25 minutes.

Mr. JONES. We are getting along so awfully slowly—

Mr. STAFFORD. But this is very important.

Mr. JONES. I will say 25 minutes, if the gentleman suggests it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Twenty minutes of that time to be controlled on this side?

Mr. JONES. Oh, no; half on that side and half on this.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can not agree to that.

Mr. TOWNER. It will be impossible for me to speak upon this amendment and explain it in less than 10 minutes' time, as the gentleman himself knows.

Mr. JONES. I said 25 minutes at the suggestion of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TOWNER. I am speaking for myself.

Mr. JONES. Then I will say 30 minutes. That certainly is abundant time for one amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. How is the time to be divided?

Mr. JONES. Half and half.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES] asks unanimous consent that debate on the amendment now before the committee be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by himself and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Is there objection?

Mr. TOWNER. I shall object, Mr. Chairman. We shall want 20 minutes on this side.

Mr. JONES. Then I will not agree to any time now.

Mr. TOWNER. Very well; let the gentleman make a motion on the proposition.

Mr. JONES. We will take it up later.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment raises the most important and difficult question regarding the government of the Philippine Islands, that which relates to the government of the non-Christian tribes. I presume it is well known that in the Philippine Islands there are variously estimated at from seven hundred thousand to a million people who belong to non-Christian tribes. These consist of natives of the islands ranging from the very lowest degree of intelligence to those who are capable of understanding their own native languages, most of them maintaining their independent tribal forms of government, and all of them being non-Christian, pagans, or Mohammedans. The Negritos are of the very lowest order of manhood and womanhood in the islands, and are among the lowest orders known in the entire world. They are the so-called dwarfs, and, so far as we know, are practically incapable of civilization. The Igorotes are another tribe, very much higher in the scale, but still maintaining almost entirely a separate tribal organization, which has been slightly modified during the American occupancy. They are the old head-hunters and still retain a great many of their ancient characteristics. Then there is a very large group, the most important and the largest of the non-Christian tribes, the Moros or Moors. They are entirely distinct from the others. They profess and are very strongly devoted to the Mohammedan religion. They are a very warlike people, and have been able to keep up their independent organization against the rest of the islands, as well as against the Spaniards when they were in the occupancy of the islands. All of these different tribes have been governed down to the present time by what may be called a commission. Their government has always been separate and apart from the general government of the Philippine Islands. They have never been subjected to the same form and kind of government as have the rest of the islands.

It is now proposed by the terms of this bill to bring these people under the general government of the Philippine Islands; in other words, to the government of the Filipinos. More than half of the territory of the entire islands is occupied by the non-Christian tribes. It is proposed that they shall be represented in the Philippine Assembly, not by persons elected by themselves, because in most part that would be manifestly impossible, in fact, ridiculous; but they are to be represented by representatives who are to be appointed by the Governor General of the Philippine Islands, and in this way they are to be subjected to the general Philippine Government which we are instituting in this bill. In other words, the Legislature of the Philippine Islands will have the power to bring these people absolutely under its control. It is true that there is a bureau provided for afterwards in this bill, but that is administration only and does not change the fact that the power of legislating for all the non-Christian territory and all the non-Christian tribes is in the hands of the Philippine Legislature under the terms of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes more.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be used on that side and 15 minutes on this side. Gentlemen on that side have already had 5 minutes, and that will give them 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Virginia and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the provision that the majority of the committee have put into this bill is as wise a provision as could have been made for the government of the non-Christian territory and tribes if they are to be subjected to the government of the Philippine Legislature. However, I am absolutely certain that it will be exceedingly unwise to attempt to do this. In the first place, it will bring into the politics of the Philippine Islands an element of discord that will, in my judgment, make issues that ought, if possible, to be avoided. It is a responsibility which we ought not to place upon the legislature at this time. It is injecting into the future politics of the islands questions which they ought not to be called to pass upon.

That is one side of the question. On the other side is the still more important question that between the Negritos, the Igorotes, the Moros, and the Philippine people there is and has been for years, I might say for centuries, an intense hatred. That has been occasioned by the many acts of hostility that have occurred between them. It is ingrained in the very nature of all these non-Christian tribes. One of their most pronounced characteristics is that of hostility against the Filipinos. I can not take the time to give testimony regarding that, which might be given almost ad libitum. Time and time again these people, when they have been visited by Members and others, have said that they were willing to submit to the government of Americans, but they were unwilling under any circumstances to submit to the government of Filipinos. I believe that it would lead almost surely and certainly to revolt and revolution on the part of the Moros if Philippine oversight, supervision, and control and government were to be put in the hands of the legislature. If it be understood by them that they were afterwards subject to the control of the Filipinos, I do not believe that there would be any more peace in at least the southern half of the islands.

I have provided in this amendment which I offer, Mr. Chairman, for a commission to be appointed that shall have the control and government of this territory, so that in form, and for the present at least, the same form of government to which they are now subject shall be continued. The civil government which has been constituted now may be continued, so that from time to time, whenever it may be desired by the people themselves, of any part of this territory, they may be set aside from the non-Christian territory and become a part of the Christian territory. By these provisions they may themselves determine when they desire to come under the control of the Philippine Government. Eventually, as we all believe and hope, there will be unity in the government of the Philippines; but now it will not hasten—it will rather postpone—that day if we endeavor to force upon them the subjection, as they will view it, of their territory and their tribes to the Philippine Legislature. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CLINE). The gentleman has used five minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit the statement just made on this floor, that there is hatred between the non-Christian Filipinos on the one hand and their Christian brethren on the other, to pass unchallenged. The statement is not new. It has several times heretofore been circulated from one end of this country to the other, and has been accepted by many people in the very best of faith. Such a statement should not be allowed to go further without the most energetic protest on the part of those who know the true state of affairs in their own country.

The Moros in times gone by have sometimes invaded certain of the small villages inhabited by Christian Filipinos. It is also true that until a few years ago there were a handful of savages in the Philippines, known as head-hunters, who occasionally decapitated some Christian Filipinos. But it is not true, indeed it is very wide of the mark, to say that such happenings as these prove that there is any particular hatred or antagonism



between the Christian and non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines.

The lack of discrimination in forming opinions on Philippine issues shown by persons who habitually act otherwise on matters of personal moment to them is most astonishing. They seem to take at face value whatever they hear or read regardless of its soundness and without analyzing the motives that might have prompted the statement.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa is a very able lawyer, and if he would only apply to the information or statement he probably thinks he has in support of his contention regarding the supposed hatred between Christian and non-Christian Filipinos some of the common and rudimentary principles of evidence he would at once discover that such testimony is by no means plausible—indeed, is absolutely unreliable.

We are told, Mr. Chairman, that the Moros have attacked and killed Filipinos. We are told, moreover, that these Moros have again and again emphatically reiterated that they would forcibly resist any attempt at a government of their territory by the Christian Filipinos. We are further told that they love the Americans and are happy under their rule, and that they are begging to be permitted to continue to live under that rule. What are the facts? The fact is that while it is true that the Moros have attacked and killed some Filipinos, it was long ago that they did so. On the other hand, up to two years ago they have been in the habit of attacking and killing American soldiers. Why, Mr. Chairman, the number of the American troops killed by the Moros in their resistance to American control exceeded by far the number of Filipinos that they even attempted to kill in past years, not to say of those they actually did kill. That Filipino heads have become a part of the trophies of the head-hunters in times gone by is undoubtedly a fact; but, unfortunately, Spanish and American heads have also been taken to make up these trophies. What is the conclusion—the only logical conclusion—to be derived from these premises? That the Christian Filipinos were never singled out as the most desired victims of warlike Moros and head-hunting pagans, and that the Moro aversion to the Christian is a matter of religious fanaticism. It made no difference to these Mohammedans whether the victim was an American, a Spaniard, or a Filipino. All these bore the mark of the cross. With the savages their head-hunting occupation was a part of their superstition, and the color of the head mattered not.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of governing the Moros and other non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines is by no means as serious a matter as the question of governing the Indians which the Americans had to face in the early days of this Republic, and if the Christian Filipinos were given an opportunity to take care of their backward brothers they would demonstrate that the task did not even deserve to be termed a problem. In my opinion there is as much ground for the suggestion that the non-Christian Filipinos be placed outside the control of the Philippine Legislature as there would be for the suggestion that the Indians of this country should be beyond the control of Congress. There is more community of interest and race between the Christian and non-Christian Filipinos on the one hand than between the American Indians and the white Americans on the other.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will retard the final solution of this question. I am decidedly opposed to it, and I should be against the passage of this bill if that amendment were to be adopted.

I have already stated in my main speech on this bill that the plan of representation given to the inhabitants of the non-Christian tribes does not appeal to me; but that I have submitted to that proposal, because, after all, the number of the appointed members who are to represent the non-Christians is so small in comparison with the rest of the legislature that in practice the result will be that the whole of the Philippines will be under the control of the elected representatives of the Filipino people.

In support of the theory that there is a very deep antagonism between the Christian and the non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines there have been printed, Mr. Chairman, not only in the newspapers, but also in Government publications, alleged speeches made by Moro chiefs on different occasions. I have also read—it was not my good fortune to be present at the time—the speech of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER], informing this House of similar addresses delivered to him during his recent visit in the islands by some important heads of tribes and by prominent dattos among the Moros. It has always been a matter that puzzled me to find all these speeches and addresses as good pieces of literature as the best of our orators upon the floor of this House could present, for it was too difficult for an ordinary intellect

like mine to explain how uneducated people, some of them indeed thoroughly uncivilized, could match their oratorical qualities with highly educated men who made it their business to study and practice eloquence.

I wonder if the hand that penned these speeches was a gloved hand? I wonder if the translator of these speeches—for they were translated into English in order that they might be understood by the addressee—was really making a speech of his own? Be that as it may, we have on our side reason and eloquent facts that tell the situation more convincingly than any words, certainly than all these speeches and addresses. To these facts I wish to call the attention of the committee, so that it may learn something besides the old theory regarding the Philippine situation.

The Moro Province is to-day governed by a civil governor. No longer is the Moro constantly pursued by a man with a gun. A new law has been enacted since Gov. Harrison became Governor General of the Philippines for the administration of the affairs in the territory mainly inhabited by the Mohammedans. This change has taken place with the approval of the War Department, and the result demonstrates that the Moro lives peacefully under civil authorities and that the Moros can get along together with Christian Filipinos and can work hand in hand with them for their common welfare. The governor of the Moro Province, it must be said, is one of the ablest and most industrious American officials who ever landed on Philippine soil. If at all possible to govern the Moros through civil agencies, the man who has the qualifications to show its practicability is the man chosen by Gov. Gen. Harrison—Frank W. Carpenter.

Gov. Carpenter has been in full charge of the Department of Mindanao—that is the name given now to the old Moro Province, and it includes the territory in the island of Mindanao inhabited by pagans—for fully 10 months, and during that time there has been no disorder nor have the Moros ever risen in arms against their government. Gov. Carpenter was given definite instructions by the Governor General as to the policies he should pursue in governing the Moro country. He was told to make that country as much a real part of the Philippine Islands as any other Province of the archipelago. That meant that good and friendly relations between the Mohammedan and Christian Filipinos should be fostered and that the Moros should be as early as possible given the same opportunities for education, sanitation, and material development as the inhabitants of other Provinces of the archipelago.

Gov. Carpenter, with that quickness of mind that is his peculiar gift, grasped at once the task he was called upon to discharge, and, with the energy and determination with which he always enters on his undertakings, he saw to it that the instructions of Gov. Harrison were at once put into effect. And so we now have in the Moro Province more schools, more roads, better sanitation, and more cultivated land than there ever was before.

A spectacle doubtless astonishing to men who feel as does the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is likewise offered—a provincial board administering subprovinces of the department of Mindanao and Jolo and composed of a Filipino as governor, a Mohammedan as third member, and an American as treasurer. How nearly true it is that the Moro hates to have anything to do with the Filipino, how much he dislikes any other government but a strong, purely American-controlled government, we can judge from the address which this Moslem third member delivered on the inauguration of the provincial government—of which he is a member by appointment of Mr. Carpenter. I shall call the attention of the committee to this paragraph of that speech:

He who thinks that it is impossible for the Moslem and the Filipino to live together in peace and participate together in the government is foolish and lacks wisdom.

We therefore see, Mr. Chairman, a Filipino and a Moro working together in the government of their common province, and this gives us the best evidence that the Moro and the Filipino do like each other and that they can live together not only peacefully but harmoniously.

With regard to the other non-Christian inhabitants of the archipelago I shall have very little to say. Even he who is most pessimistic as to the possibility of placing this people under the Philippine Government admits that in this case the difficulties are less than in the case of the Moros. I say without hesitation that there is no difficulty whatever in having this people governed by Christian Filipinos. Had a different policy been pursued by the former secretary of the interior in the management of the affairs of this people, they would have advanced more than they have thus far, and there would have been to-day a fully established intercommunication between them and the Christian Filipinos. The new secretary of the in-



terior is, thank God, wise enough to see that the old policy was wrong and injurious, and his new policy is to promote the intermingling of these pagans with the Christian Filipinos. He has appointed a delegate whose paramount duty is to bring about this result. Less appropriation for so-called scientific researches and more for the education, sanitation, and means of communication of this people is the watchword of Secretary Winfred T. Denison. In connection with this remark I wish to insert in the RECORD a quotation from an address delivered by Secretary Denison before the Manila City Club, as follows:

To be concrete: Within the last few days the question has come to me whether I would authorize the expenditure of \$500, more or less, for the photographing of mollusks.

Now, it happens that I have just returned from the Mountain Province where I found a deep necessity and a great demand for school-teachers and no money to provide them. I had this choice: Should I spend \$500 for photographing these mollusks, or should I spend it for a school-teacher? I could pay the whole share of the Insular Government in another teacher for the cost of these photographs. I am not unaware that the world outside of the Philippines may possibly prefer the photographs of the mollusks to teachers in the Mountain Province, but can there be any doubt in the mind of anyone that my duty is to spend that money for the interest of the Philippines, rather than to further what may be considered the interest of the scientific world at large?

This is a type of the questions which are constantly arising. It is an extreme one, and one that is unusually ridiculous, but nevertheless it serves to make the point.

Every requisition for expenditure involves a choice of the purpose proposed as against all other possible purposes, and it behooves an alien administrator to have a care lest he gives the hobbies of his own nation priority over the interest of the people whose money he is spending.

#### PEOPLE WITHOUT MEDICAL CARE.

A similar thing happened in the first month I was here. I had been to Palawan, and had found there 40,000 people without a doctor. This gave me a shock which I shall never forget, and which has not been minimized by my having subsequently found the same thing on a still larger scale in the Mountain Province. I had visited the Moros in the southern end of Palawan, and had found them eager for a school-teacher—even grown men petitioning for leave themselves to go to school. I had been to the Cullion leper colony, and had received the petitions of those 6 sisters of St. Paul de Chartres who were doing all the nursing for 250 hospital patients and caring for the whole outpatient and dispensary service besides; and they had asked for 2 more nurses and \$50 a month for extra delicacies for the more desperate among their cases.

With these things in my mind I returned to Manila; and there the very first thing that came to me was an application for leave to spend \$14,000 for printing the results of ethnological research into the habits of the Bukidnons and other non-Christian tribes, and I said to myself: Is it for the interest of the Filipino people that these manuscripts should be printed at such a cost, rather than that school-teachers and doctors should be sent to Palawan and more help to those weary sisters of St. Paul de Chartres and the lepers in their care?

Is it for the interest of the Filipino people to make such researches and to print their results in order to inform the American people and the outside scientific world about the ways and habits of the Bukidnons, rather than to send school-teachers to teach the Bukidnons the ways of the outside world?

It was urged that these expenses for printing were a mere bagatelle compared with the cost of collecting the information, and that it was a pity to lose the results of these researches for a sum so small when compared with the vast total of cost already incurred in collecting the information.

But for \$14,000 I could either cover the Mountain Province with school-teachers or cover Palawan with doctors or fill Cullion with nurses, while the outside world, if it finds itself in peremptory need of this knowledge, may possibly be able to find the money somewhere except in the pockets of the Filipino people.

Then it was urged that the administrative officers of the Mountain Province, the governor, the lieutenant governors, and all the Americans who have to deal with those people up there, needed these researches to guide them in their work. That might possibly, to my mind, be a justification for the expense, so I set that question aside until I could visit the Province, and then I asked everyone of these officers the question, and I found that not one of them had ever made any practical use of any of these things. "Interesting," they said, "from the point of view of the advancement of the science of the world, but of no actual practical use to the Mountain Province."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has expired.

Mr. QUEZON. May I have one minute more?

Mr. JONES. I yield one minute more to the gentleman.

Mr. QUEZON. The foregoing statement is very interesting, since it shows—at least by implication—what had been done before Secretary Denison's time, and was then heralded as the greatest thing certain men ever did.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Iowa will not press his amendment. The gentleman from Iowa knows that the Philippine Commission has absolute control over the Moro and non-Christian tribes, and that since the appointment by the President of a majority of Filipinos on the commission that the actual fact is that the Moros and other non-Christian inhabitants of the islands are absolutely governed by Christian Filipinos. Were it true that there was a dislike on the part of these Christian Filipinos for the Moros, it would have been plainly shown in the conduct of the present Philippine Commission; yet the fact is that although the revenues of the Philippine Islands have fallen off, and in spite of the absolute necessity for retrenchment, this Filipinized commission has appropriated more

money than ever for the pagans, and has given for the department of Mindanao and Sulu \$225,000; for Agusan, \$17,000; and for public works of general character to be carried out in these countries, \$27,225. With these concrete facts I believe the gentleman must be convinced of the lack of foundation for what he heard or read about antagonism between the Christians and non-Christians. [Applause.]

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, of course, that to discuss an important subject like this in five minutes is entirely out of the question. I want to refer to one or two items in the time left to me. The gentleman from the Philippine Islands, who has just spoken, believes all that he has said or he would not have said it. I have that faith in his intellectual honesty. If there was one thing, however, that I found that surprised me more than any other, it was the absolute and complete ignorance of the Christian Filipinos in respect to the non-Christians in the Philippine Islands. While I think the gentleman from the Philippine Islands has stated the situation as he believes it, yet if he had been with me and visited the wild tribes—

Mr. QUEZON. Oh, I have visited them a good many times.

Mr. MILLER. My dear sir, without entering into any controversy about that, as a matter of fact the non-Christian people, whether they ought to or whether they ought not, do look with very great hostility upon the Christian people. There is no question about that at all; it is as plain and straight as that A, B, and C are the first letters of the alphabet. I think that condition is being removed. It is going to be removed, of course; but it exists to-day.

The gentleman from the Philippine Islands said something about the splendid results from establishing the civil government among the Moros. What he said is true. For several years they have been preparing the way to establish a civil government in the Moro territory.

They reached a condition of pacification in the Moro part of the islands such that a civil government was instituted about a year ago, and the man who has been put in charge is one of the very best men to be found for the purpose; but everybody knows this, that it was never dared to put that civil government into existence until after the Governor General publicly, before an assemblage of Moro datos, gathered at Lake Lanao, guaranteed to them that the civil governor would be an American and not a Filipino. I hope we can be correctly understood. That condition exists. It is a vital condition. It is being eradicated. There is no reason why Christian and non-Christian Filipinos should be fighting each other or should hate each other. The present resulting situation comes from previous ages and times of warfare and strife. They have not yet become acquainted with each other. When they do become acquainted with each other and recognize that they are children of the same race there will be a change in their condition, but the change is not now. If anybody should really desire to know just how a great many of the wild people feel there is plenty of literature in which they have expressed themselves. I myself have a great pile of manuscript, testimony taken down verbatim by a Christian Filipino stenographer, showing the ideas and desires of the wild men of the north, of the south, and throughout the islands. There was not a dissenting voice anywhere, from one end of the islands to the other, among those wild people, and while I am in favor of a system of government here that will gradually let the Christian Filipino have complete control over all of the territory, yet, it seems to me, to do so now without considerable restriction would be to permit a grave situation to result. As soon as the Christian Filipinos become better acquainted with the non-Christians and the non-Christians become better acquainted with the Christians, so that they know and understand each other and their purposes are found not to be hostile to each other, then you can have a result making possible the principle of this bill. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa may not meet exactly in every respect my own ideas—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I agree entirely with what has been said by gentlemen on the other side as to the difficulty surrounding this particular subject, but I can not agree that the Moros are as much averse to being governed by the Filipinos as has been stated, or that the Filipinos, having no sympathy for them, would not treat them fairly. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, I wish to give to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] a concrete fact which I think will change, or at least ought to change, his opinion upon this subject. It is well known that the revenues of the islands have fallen off to such



an extent that retrenchment has become absolutely necessary, and yet the Philippine Commission, now under the control of the Filipinos, there being five Filipinos to four Americans, has increased the appropriations for Agusan, Nueva Vizcaya, and the mountain Provinces, and has granted a subsidy of \$112,500 to be used in the Moro Province, now called the Province of Mindanao and Sulu. This was done upon the motion of a Filipino member of the commission. As long as the commission was dominated by Americans no such thing as this ever occurred.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman explain further by saying what he means by the statement that nothing like that was ever done by the American commission?

Mr. JONES. I mean to say that the American commission has never granted a sum like that—a subsidy, as it were—to the Moro Province. The increased appropriations of which I have spoken—oh, the gentleman shakes his head, but it is absolutely true—were made for the wild tribes at the very time that the appropriations for the civilized Provinces were being cut down.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman must know that heretofore the whole Moro country has been military, and now there is a civil governor.

Mr. JONES. That has absolutely no bearing on the subject whatever. They have a civil governor now instead of a military governor.

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. In other words, the Governor General of the Philippine Islands has selected as the governor of the Moro Province a civilian instead of a military man, as has been the case in the past. The Government itself has not been changed. The facts which I have stated constitute an absolute and irrefutable reply to the charges that have been so frequently made to the effect that the Filipinos, if given control of the Government, would neglect the interests of the wild tribes.

Mr. Chairman, further on in this bill, in the twenty-second section, it is provided:

There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the Bureau of Non-Christian Tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Under this provision the administrative affairs of the non-Christian tribes will be cared for. There is no necessity for the appointment of a commission of three members at a salary of \$5,000 each, to be paid by the Filipino people. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions of this bill relating to the wild tribes gave the committee a great deal of concern. I, for one, consulted with a great many Americans familiar with affairs in the islands, and one of those was the former Vice Governor General, Mr. Gilbert. He thoroughly indorsed and approved these provisions of the bill, although he did not give his approval to one or two other provisions, particularly the preamble and the requirement of the confirmation by the senate of the appointees of the Governor General. I did not inform Gov. Gilbert as to all the provisions of the bill, and he might not have approved others; but he was outspoken in his approval of the one relating to the appointment of senators and representatives for the Provinces not now represented in the assembly. Gov. Gilbert has returned to the islands, I may add, to make his permanent home there. I have talked with no one familiar with governmental affairs in the Philippines who did not approve this provision save only one member of the supreme court, for whose judgment, I may say, I have great respect. Justice Trent alone of all those consulted by me was of the opinion that the provision contained in the bill was not the wisest solution of this difficult problem.

Mr. Chairman, no one can doubt but that the Governor General will appoint high-minded, experienced, and able men to represent the wild tribes, that he will select the very best men that can be found. Such men will see to it that the interests of the wild men are not neglected. It is proposed to rid the Philippines of the Philippine Commission, which, under American control, became so odious to their people.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the rest of my time.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the last statement which the gentleman from Virginia makes upon the floor of this House, that nearly everybody thinks the commission system of governing the non-Christian tribes ought to be abolished, is so absolutely far from the truth, in my judgment, that it is almost ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, it is ungracious always to say anything regarding people derogatory of them, and if the statement which I made had not been challenged on the floor regarding the feeling between the Filipinos and the non-Christian tribes,

I should not now read and put into the Record this testimony, but I am going to quote from two very good Democratic authorities, one of them the present Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Redfield, and this is what he says:

It is common knowledge that deep hatred exists between the Igorrotes of the mountains and the Tagalogs of the plains, and that the Moros look with fanatical contempt upon the non-Moslem and physically weak dwellers in the seacoast cities. It did not need the plain statement of the Moro chiefs to Mr. Dickinson, that though they had laid down the bolo at the American command they would take it up again should the American leave, to show that the removal of the strong hand of law from the Moro people would mean a continuance of that riot and bloodshed which has for centuries prevailed where they were free to follow their natural training and habits. But let the Moros speak for themselves.

And remember, gentlemen, this is Secretary Dickinson, a Democrat, who was sent there for the express purpose of making this investigation.

At a meeting between the Secretary of War and the Moro leader at Jolo, August 24, 1910, the former secretary to the Sultan of Sulu was selected by the Moros to speak for them. He said:

"We have only a little to say, and that says we are happy to be under the sovereignty of the Americans. There has been some talking about that the Filipinos want to tear themselves off from the Americans and that they want to tear us away, too—tear us away with them. If the Americans should give the Moro country over to the Filipinos they would be responsible to God for the blood that would be shed, because it would be the same thing as if you put two fighting cocks into one bag, for there would be fighting, sure."

On August 23, 1910, a public meeting was held in the theater at Zamboanga, Island of Mindanao. At this meeting Datu Sacauran said:

"I am an old man. I do not want any more trouble. But if it should come to that—that we should be given over to the Filipinos—I still would fight."

He was followed by another leader, who said:

"I am not a civilized man, but I have learned that slavery, killing, and stealing is a bad thing; we do it no more. But if after that it should be that we shall be given over to another race we had better all be hanged."

The final speaker was Nadji Nungul, who spoke as follows:

"The Secretary of War must look the matter in the face. We are a different race; we have a different religion; we are Mohammedans; and if we should be given over to the Filipinos, how much more would they treat us badly when they treated even the Spanish badly who were their own mothers and their own fathers in generation? How did they treat them? Think about it. Think twice. We far prefer to be in the hands of the Americans, who are father and mother to us now, than to be turned over to another people."

And that is the feeling that now exists between the non-Christian tribes and the Filipinos.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TOWNER. Does that exhaust my time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman is exhausted.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has three minutes remaining.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has challenged the correctness of my statement that the Filipinos would treat the members of the wild tribes fairly if permitted to govern them and has read extracts from a speech delivered by the Secretary of Commerce upon this floor when he was a Member of this body to support his statement that they would not do so. I do not care to comment upon the statements in that speech. Immediately upon its delivery I made a reply to it, as the gentleman knows, or, if not, as he will find upon examining the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I need not repeat what I then said, but I stand by every word of that speech now.

But, Mr. Chairman, it has been several years since the Secretary of Commerce was in the islands. It has been several years since Secretary of War Dickinson, from whose report he quoted, was in the islands. I have furnished the House with concrete facts that absolutely overthrow and refute everything that has been said by those who hold that the Filipinos would not govern the wild men justly. I have shown that, despite the fact that it was said in the Philippine Islands when the Philippine Commission was Filipinized by President Wilson, it would result in the mistreatment of the wild tribes, the very reverse has been true. So far from those evil predictions materializing, the Filipinization of the commission has resulted in more being done for the wild tribes than had ever before been done for the improvement of their condition, and that at a time when the insular revenues were falling off and retrenchment was the order of the day throughout the civilized Provinces.

This statement the gentleman has not attempted to answer. It is a full and complete answer to the oft-repeated assertion that the Filipinos had no sympathy for the Moros, at least, and therefore ought not to be entrusted with their government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.



Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

In line 3, on page 13, I move to strike out the words following the word "Islands"—all the remainder of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 13, by striking out, in line 3, all of the section after the word "Islands."

The words stricken out are: "And modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I ask to have that amendment adopted is this: Not only does this section put into the hands of the Philippine Government that is now to be instituted under this bill the government of the non-Christian tribes, not only does it provide that they shall be represented in this section by representatives appointed by the governor general, but it expressly provides that the legislature of the Philippine Islands may modify, amend, or repeal any provision of this section. In other words, it gives with one hand the power of representation, and on the other hand it withholds it whenever the Philippine Assembly may desire to do so. In other words, it allows the Philippine Assembly at its first meeting to pass a law under which the non-Christian population shall not be represented or to modify the representation in any way it desires. In other words, it leaves the government of the non-Christian territory and the non-Christian tribes exclusively in the hands of the Filipinos. The gentleman says that the Philippine Assembly is well qualified to take care of non-Christian tribes; that the Filipino people are more liberal than the Americans. The gentleman would really, I presume, cause the committee to believe, if he could, that there was no necessity in behalf of the non-Christian tribes for increasing the appropriations from year to year. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that fact is one of the reasons why these amendments ought to be adopted—that they have just begun the civilization of the non-Christian tribes. If anything is done such as it demanded, it will, of course, necessitate increasing expenditures from time to time.

The gentleman makes a great virtue of such action. They could do no less if they were doing anything like their duty. And it is not that. I do not charge that the Filipinos will not do what they think their duty is. I believe, though, that it is unwise to put this responsibility upon them now, this great problem, for it will be one; and I believe when it is thoroughly understood by the non-Christian tribes themselves that they are no longer subject to the immediate government of the Americans, there will be difficulty throughout all that territory. The present governor general of the Moros is an American. He stands there representing to them the American Government. In my judgment he is, perhaps, the wisest and best man that could be appointed for such place. In my judgment if he can not succeed in the civil government of the Moros, no man can succeed. But his place will be taken when this bill becomes a law, and whatever government will of necessity be established there will not be to them the Government of America as it is now; it will be the government of the Filipinos, which they so much dislike and which they so much fear. That is the danger, Mr. Chairman, in the situation.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Committee on Insular Affairs in framing this bill was to give to the Filipinos the most autonomous form of government that could be framed. The majority members of the committee infinitely regret that they have not been able to frame a bill that meets the approval of all of the leaders on the other side of the House. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] does not at all agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the leader of that side of the House, as to some of the provisions of this bill. The gentleman from Illinois stated that the only objection he had to the governmental features of this bill was that they were too illiberal. He said he wanted to extend to the Filipinos the fullest measure of self-government possible in order that they might demonstrate whether or not they were fit for self-government. The gentleman from Iowa thinks that we go too far, and that this bill ought to be so modified as not to permit the Philippine Legislature to change the provisions of this section. I do not agree with the gentleman from Iowa. Neither am I willing to go as far as the gentleman from Illinois professes to desire to go. I occupy a middle and, I hope, a more consistent ground than either of these gentlemen.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES. I believe that as to all questions relating to redistributing the islands and the apportionment of members for the legislature—the senate as well as the house of representatives—we can safely leave them to the Philippine Legislature.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. JONES. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. Has he changed his mind from what it was a year ago when he introduced the first Jones bill? The bill provided a much larger measure of self-government to the islands, provided for independence absolutely at a time fixed, and yet now this bill does much less in granting power to the Filipinos and says not one word about fixing the time for independence.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, my answer is that I have stated more than once during the course of this debate that this bill did not fully represent my individual ideas as to Philippine independence. Personally I would prefer to fix in this bill, as in the former one, a definite date for Philippine independence. I believe that in the course of five or six years from now—and that bill provided for a probationary government to last for eight years—that the Filipinos will be entirely prepared to establish and maintain a government of their own. But, as I have said before, there are gentlemen of my own party who think that it is not best to fix a definite date for independence, and their opinions have weight with me. And I bow, and I bow gracefully, Mr. Chairman, to the dictates of my party upon this subject as expressed in the national Democratic platform adopted at Baltimore.

Mr. MILLER. Does the gentleman think this corresponds with the declaration of the great Democratic Party in the Baltimore platform?

Mr. JONES. I do.

Mr. MILLER. What about neutralization?

Mr. JONES. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I can easily anticipate what he is going to say. I believe that an effort should be made to neutralize the islands, but I do not believe that that proposition should find a place in this bill, and I will say further to the gentleman that when the time comes, if it ever does, when it is possible to secure such neutralization an earnest effort will be made to do it. But the gentleman must realize that conditions in Europe are such to-day that it would be futile to attempt it at this time. The Democrats will bring forward a resolution when the time comes, having for its object the neutralization of the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have one minute more in which to answer a question which I wish to propound to him.

Mr. JONES. I am perfectly willing to answer the gentleman's question if I can, but my time has expired.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman may have one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Has not the question of the neutralization of the islands just as much a place in this bill as a declaration of our intent that we propose to give the islands their independence?

Mr. JONES. Not a bit of it. The gentleman does not wish to insert in the preamble of this bill a neutralization proposition, I think.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want any preamble in the bill at all. You have seen fit to put one in. Why not put the other in?

Mr. JONES. The gentleman wishes a neutralization measure incorporated in the body of this bill. To that I can not agree. There is no place in this bill for such a proposition. It must be a separate and independent measure.

Mr. MILLER. I am delighted that the gentleman has made such a splendid argument against his own preamble.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, by striking out, in line 9, page 12, after the word "district," all the remainder of the paragraph down to line 23, to the colon before the word "Provided."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 12, by striking out all of page 12 after the word "district," in line 9, down to and including the word "Assembly," in line 23.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that. The first part of that has gone out. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] offered an amendment covering that, and the first part of that has gone out.

Mr. MILLER. Then my amendment is perfectly proper.

Mr. JONES. You want to strike out, then, the amendment to this section which was adopted by practically unanimous consent. That section has been amended now, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman from Minnesota, Does his motion commence in line 9?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; line 9, after the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. TOWNER. That sentence might be considered separately in a motion, I will say; but it would not do to strike out the next sentence, because that would include the sentence that has been amended, and the amendment has been agreed upon.

Mr. MILLER. Did that amendment begin in line 19?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out after the word "district," in line 9, page 12, the remainder down to and including the word "district," in line 13.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 12, by striking out, after the word "district," in line 9, down to and including the word "district," in line 13.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the difficulty that the majority Members of the Committee were in when trying to frame some legislation that would give an appearance of looking after the interests of the non-Christian tribes, but I am not exactly in agreement with them in the idea that they have hit upon a happy solution. I think it is absolutely ludicrous. Opinions, of course, may differ, but that is the way it seems to me.

Let us see what this does. You propose to organize one senate district. That senate district would stretch over and touch almost every island in the whole archipelago; just where, we do not know. The territorial limits in the islands are not defined with accuracy in many places. There are two general classes of non-Christian territory, some that are purely non-Christian and some that are quasi Christian, like Nueva, Viscaya, Palawan, and Mindoro. This makes one district for a thousand different places. I do not know, when a man is appointed, if he can ever find out just what his territory and district is. There are to be nine representatives. I suppose they could be so arranged that they would comprehend possibly most of the non-Christian territory. But it is going to be very dubious and difficult to locate those districts. But let us waive that, just to be good natured to-day. Is this a representative government? Oh, what a farce to put a provision like that in a bill and have it labeled "autonomy and self-government"!

Whom are these people representing? The answer will come back, "The non-Christian tribes." The chances are ten to one that the man appointed will never have seen the district or people that he represents. He knows nothing whatever about them. Representative government! Having the Governor General appoint two senators and nine representatives to represent some people that they do not know and have never seen?

Mr. HELM. Is not that what they have been getting?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, it is entirely different. I am perfectly frank to say that I believe in a change in the system that is now or has been heretofore in vogue in the islands, but this does not reach the situation. Not only is that true, but you are appointing new men. They are to be Filipinos, of course. I can just see the majority members of this committee shivering up their souls in holy horror at the thought of Americans sitting in the Filipino Legislature to represent these non-Christian people. I would not be in favor of that myself. But if you are going to have such a left-handed corkscrew system as that, by all means appoint Filipinos to it. But you can never escape the fact that when you appoint a Tagalo or a Viscayan or a Pangasinan or an Ilocano or a Bicol or a Cagayanese or a Zambalan to represent a Moro you are doing the same thing as though you to-day appointed a Frenchman to represent a constituency of Germans in a parliament. You would be appointing a man who would not at this hour dare to go to see his people, and I know whereof I speak.

But let us not dwell so much upon the Moros. Should you appoint an Ilocano to represent an Ifugao and tell him he had to go and consult with his constituent, that consultation would be short and interesting, and there are 125,000 Ifugaos. The same would be true of the Bontocs, the Kalingas, the Apayaos, or the Benguets, or the people inhabiting Lepanto.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like three minutes more. I should like to complete this statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Now, I can see that the committee were up against a very difficult situation, and possibly in the extremity of their dilemma finally wrote this language into the bill. I am not surprised that no one of them has been able to stand on this floor and justify it. It permits of no justification. If the people whom you call non-Christian are not capable of self-government or participating in self-government, then shape your government so they will not, but do not go through the farce of putting into a bill the shadow of representation. Why, I am reliably informed that the present secretary of the interior recently said in an interview, which has been widely published—and he has not denied it—that he was in favor of giving the right of the franchise to the Tagbanuas. They live on the island of Palawan, and are among the wildest people to be found in the islands. I do not mean by that the most vicious or cruel, but they are among the wildest people to be found in the islands, with no more comprehension of voting than a Hot-tentot who had never seen a white man in his life. The idea is utterly ridiculous and nonsensical. The unfortunate part of it is that the present secretary of the interior happens to be the man in charge of the region. When he goes there and sees his people he will change his mind.

There is another element in this, Mr. Chairman, that I am astounded that democracy should champion. I have always understood that democracy stood for the freedom and the liberty of the individual and for the complete autonomy of each locality, for the divorce and separation of tyrannical power from the power of the people. But what have you here? You are permitting the Governor General to name two senators, his own personal friends, his henchmen, his dog Fido, and his dog Towzer, and nine representatives to sit in the legislative body, to influence legislation there, and they are the hands of the Executive and not the legislative branch at all. Did you ever hear of such a scheme of government as that? I know the chairman stated a fact when he said that he knows the vice governor general, Mr. Gilbert, liked this proposition. I will tell you why. He liked it because he saw that it would strengthen the hands of the Governor General, and for that reason alone. It will give him tremendous power and strength in the legislative branch, and here you are turning your backs upon the wisdom of your fathers, forsaking for all time the logic of your own minds, abandoning the experience of humanity, and thrusting the tyranny of the Executive upon the power of the representatives of the people in the legislative assembly.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, it has been so long since I left college, so long since I studied Latin, that I hesitate to make use of Latin words. I believe the itch for writing is described in Latin as a case of *cacoethes scribendi*. I would therefore describe the disease with which the gentleman from Minnesota is afflicted as *cacoethes alteratus*, which I take to mean an itch for offering amendments. [Laughter.]

Mr. HELM. Let us have those words taken down. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have those words translated. I do not know whether I have been complimented or abused, and I think I have a right to know.

Mr. JONES. My translation of them is "an itch for offering amendments."

Mr. MILLER. Is that the translation of the gentleman's Latin?

Mr. JONES. My Latin may be bad, but if my translation of it is correct, then it correctly describes the disease with which the gentleman is badly afflicted.

Mr. MILLER. I think the gentleman's Latin was good, but his pronunciation was atrocious.

Mr. JONES. I do not think there is anything wrong about my translation.

Mr. MILLER. If I have anything of the kind described by the gentleman, I do not know where I caught it; but I have just been over on the Democratic side for the first time since I have been in this House. [Laughter.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has correctly said that the government of the wild tribes in the Philippines presents a very difficult problem. We all concede that, but I want to assure the House that this proposition has received more careful consideration at the hands of the committee than perhaps any other, possibly all others in the bill together. It is the desire of the committee to provide the very best government that is practicable for the people of the wild tribes. We all realize that they are not capable, as are the inhabitants of the civilized and Christianized Provinces, to elect their officials.



The situation in the Philippines is a peculiar one, and it has to be dealt with according to the conditions which surround it. The committee have felt that the wild tribes ought to have representation in the legislature, and since it would be farcical to permit them to elect their representatives we decided that the very best that could possibly be done to protect their interests would be to have the Governor General appoint their representatives. This will certainly insure their being represented by men of character and ability who will understand their needs. The gentleman says they are willing to trust the Americans, and therefore I have no doubt but that they are willing to trust the American Governor General to appoint their representatives. I can not conceive of any better plan than that; and I want to say to the gentleman, who seems to be having some trouble with framing his amendment, that even if it were adopted it would leave the subject in a most unfortunate situation. It would strike out the provision which provides for dividing certain territory into one senatorial and nine representative districts, but would still impose upon the Governor General the responsibility and duty of appointing two senators and nine representatives.

Mr. MILLER. If the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment, I will offer one later to correct that difficulty.

Mr. JONES. It was not my intention to help the gentleman perfect his amendment, but just to call attention to the fact that if it were adopted it would leave the bill in an unfortunate situation.

Mr. Chairman. I ask for a vote.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Whatever might be our impression as to Philippine independence and local self-government, whether immediate or deferred, I think there is not a Member on either side that does not recognize that this non-Christian problem is the most delicate question we will have to consider. The committee in its consideration recognized that. There are two separate clauses which suggest the seriousness of the situation. I am quite certain that if you read these two provisions in the bill that you will find there is going to be a conflict here. The attempt to meet the Moro situation has resulted in a possible conflict of authority in the bill.

The delicacy of this situation is suggested in lines 16 to 23, which places legislative authority in the Governor General, through appointment, by making a special provision that is not found in other parts of the islands where the Philippine Assembly is wholly in control. The assembly thus constituted will be partly elective and partly appointive. That indicates that the non-Christian tribes really make a delicate situation in the government over there, which ought not to be too readily surrendered to a people not well disciplined in government. Then, on page 20, to which our attention was called awhile ago by the chairman, there is another provision which suggests the same thing. By this clause there is to be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau which is to have full control of the interests of these non-Christian sections. This bureau is a creature of the Philippine Legislature, while the representatives of these non-Christian people are creatures of the Governor General. Allegiance is to different authorities.

Now, the conflict I see in the bill that we had up before is that in the one case the representatives of the non-Christian tribes are to be appointed by the Governor General. There will be 9 of them, and that will be one-tenth of the legislature if there are 90 members, or not quite one-tenth of the whole, as the bill provides for 90 members from the Christian and 9 members from the non-Christian sections. The 9 are appointed by the Governor General and have the right to speak, to vote, and to hold office—in a word, the same right of any other member elected. The legislature is thus composed of elective and appointive members with the same rights in the body.

Then, on the other hand, there is to be a bureau created by the Philippine Legislature, and that bureau is to have full control of matters pertaining to the non-Christian tribes. In the first place, you will have nine members appointed by the Governor General to have a position in the legislature, and on the other hand we have here a bureau created by the Philippine Legislature to have full control.

Mr. JONES. Not to have full control. The bureau does not have any legislative authority; its authority is purely ministerial. There are some 23 or more bureaus there now through which the affairs that have been placed under these bureaus are administered. The legislature legislates as to these bureaus and the matters that pertain to them pass through the bureau.

Mr. FESS. The bill says:

And shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Mr. JONES. That language is put in there advisedly. The secretary of the interior had the same authority, but he was subject, of course, to the laws prescribed by the commission.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, it is not clear yet in my mind that there may not be a conflict here, because the source of authority in the one place is elective and in the other it is appointive.

Mr. JONES. That difficulty suggested itself to my mind in the beginning, but I consulted with the officials in the War Department and this language was supposed to be the language which would best cover the situation.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I think the probabilities are that what was intended was to convey in the appointment of the bureau administrative power only, leaving the legislative power in the hands of the appointees of the government.

Mr. JONES. That was unquestionably the intention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks that his time be extended two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the principle of giving appointive offices legislative functions, I think, is more or less to be criticized. For example, we are to have nine members appointed by the Governor General without the consent on the part of the senate or any other body. They are to be given legislative functions. I fear we are going too fast in this legislation. I think it would be safer for us to still retain the authority over the non-Christian tribes in the government here rather than to put it over entirely into the hands of the Philippine Legislature. That is the serious question that we are discussing. I believe that if our concern is to move safely that we are going a little too rapidly here; that while the Philippine Legislature would like to exercise full control over the non-Christian tribes, it would be safer for all concerned if we would retain that authority until we can see how the present bill will work, which passes over to the Filipinos the senate as well as the house of representatives.

Therefore the question in my mind is, Is it better for all concerned, the Filipino as well as the non-Christian peoples, to give the control of the non-Christian tribes into the hands of the Philippine Legislature, or would it be better for us to retain the supervision over the non-Christian tribes until we see the progress in the Philippine Legislature on these matters that pass through their hands? That is the chief question that arises here. It seems to me that we are going too rapidly, and I am fearful of the effects of it.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I think that one of the errors that the gentlemen on the Republican side of the House make in the consideration of this bill is the assumption that the Filipinos are not a vigorous nation or race of people capable of the very highest standards of development. You charge up to the Filipino people and hold them responsible for all of the shortcomings of the Spanish régime. Self-government was denied the Filipinos by the Spanish people, yet you charge up their failure to develop into a world-power as a liability of the Filipino people, when they were in subjection, and did not have the control or management of their own Government. We know enough to know what usually follows, and always has followed, in the wake of Spanish control. In the next place you charge up against the Filipino people all of the shortcomings of the American carpetbag government. These several and different commissions that the United States Government has had there undertaking to administer the affairs of the Philippine Islands—

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HELM. Just one moment. Everywhere those commissions have fallen down, and the thing I particularly have in mind is the question of slavery that has existed there ever since the American commission took control; if it is the fault of anybody, it is just as much the fault of the American commission as the fault of anyone else, and more so because the commission went right back to the fountainhead of authority, and it ought to have and could have acquired the necessary power to suppress the evil that the gentleman has complained of.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HELM. Just for a question.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman refers to the evils of the American carpetbag government. Does the gentleman mean to state that the American government over there has been productive of evil rather than good?

Mr. HELM. I am not undertaking to say that the American administration in the Philippine Islands has been a total and abject failure. It has been in large manner a success.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman says we charged up to the Filipinos—

Mr. HELM. Yes; whatever has gone wrong. The American administration has not been responsible for anything that has gone wrong, but you contend that the Filipinos are responsible, although they did not administer the government in which they had no control, still every failure is charged up against them. The whole object and purpose of this bill is to give the Filipino people a chance to exercise government. The supreme goal in all this undertaking is Philippine independence. That is what they are contending for, and when this bill becomes a law every incentive, every motive on the part of the Filipino people will be to make good, to show their capacity not only to administer and control the affairs of the Christian tribes, but they will say, "You have given us authority to participate in the administration of the government of the people whom the American people believe are hostile to us, and we are going to show you our capacity and ability to deal successfully with that responsibility."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] made a remark a little while ago that was of considerable interest to me. It seems our colleague from Kentucky [Mr. HELM] referred to the government in the Philippine Islands as a "carpetbag government." The gentleman from Ohio seemed to resent the term, and countered by asking the gentleman from Kentucky if he meant to charge that no good thing could be done by a carpetbag government; that is, as he put it, had no good thing been done by the alien government which we have forced on the Philippine people? Mr. Chairman, I say very frankly to him that I think we have done a good many excellent things in the Philippines, but it does not get rid of the fact that it is a carpetbag government, that it is an alien government, and that it is there without the consent of the people who are being governed. The people there are hostile to it, and, in my judgment, properly hostile to it, because no carpetbag government can ever be a satisfactory one to any people. Fortunately, I was quite young during the carpetbag and reconstruction era in the South, but I remember enough of that nightmare to have had it impressed on my mind so firmly that if I lived to be a thousand years old I would never forget it. All that was possibly hateful in connection with government of our people, over whom those carpetbaggers came to rule, to tyrannize, and to persecute in a political way, was done, and the gentleman's anxiety for the recognition of literacy in government the other day was conspicuously absent at that particular time. I do not want to try to force upon any people on earth the sort of government which I would not consent to have forced upon me. There is a maxim of conduct which I commend to the attention of every man in the consideration of this matter—do unto others as you would have them do unto you.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the scope and purpose of this bill is the very best thing that could be constructed for the benefit of the Filipino people. If this committee is interested with reference to these people in one thing more than another, it is in establishing that sort of relation between the American Government and the Filipino people as will give them the largest possible power to administer their own affairs. I believe that in this bill we are getting away from the bureaucratic government about which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] complains so bitterly and which was exercised under the American commission. The very fact that the administration of the government by the American commission resulted in giving the Filipino people no voice whatever is one of the sources that led us to the proposition of giving them a larger autonomy. The gentleman from Minnesota says that the appointment of two senators and nine representatives will give the Governor General autocratic power and there will be bureaucratic administration of government, which it is not our intention to give, where we are attempting to establish a representative government. That is true to a certain extent, but another thing is also true, that it is incumbent upon us as a legislative body to exercise the utmost good faith with a people for whom we are attempting to legislate. My friend from Minnesota remembers very distinctly, no doubt, that in 1905 we made a provision for a legislative assembly in the Philippines, but when we did that we absolutely retained the veto power in the Philippine Commission, and when that legislature had been elected and it was known that within 60 days it would convene for the purpose of legislating for the Filipino

people, the American commission within 10 days, before the meeting of the legislative body convened, passed 70 statutes in 10 days, covering all of the probable subjects that would be legislated upon by the Filipino—taking it out of the hands of the legislature that was elected by the people to legislate upon those subjects, and when they did legislate, made their legislation absolutely secure, so far as control was concerned, in the hands of the commission.

Of course there is no bureaucracy in that the gentleman will contend. Of course there was no bureaucracy in their taking out of the hands of the legally constituted body elected for that purpose not only the right but the power to say what kind of legislation they wanted enacted; and in the fact of that historic fact, Mr. Chairman, it ill becomes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] to criticize this bill on the theory of its creating a bureaucratic form of government in the hands of the Governor General. I submit that, so far as the non-Christian people are concerned, that there is a wide difference between a legislative body that is constituted by the two senators and nine representatives and a bureau that is constituted to administer whatever the legislative body prescribes for their government. It is as separate as it is in this country, where we legislate and put in the hands of our executive officers the administration of the laws that we pass, and I take it that is the purpose that the chairman of the committee and his associates had in framing this bill and to administer for the non-Christian tribes. On the whole, Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me, it is the very wisest possible thing we could do. It is not possible even to give them absolute representation without any authority over it, and so we come just as nearly as we possibly could to giving them representation in their own legislative body and create an entirely independent bureau to administer the laws that we pass for them. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 17. That the terms of office of elective senators and representatives shall be four years from the 16th of October following their election. In case of vacancy among the elective members of the senate or in the house of representatives, special elections may be held in the districts wherein such vacancy occurred under such regulations as may be prescribed by law, but senators or representatives elected in such cases shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred. Senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the word "four," in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say to the gentleman from Iowa that he recognized the gentleman from the Philippines [Mr. QUEZON].

Mr. TOWNER. I want this amendment passed on, if the gentleman will permit. Will the gentleman permit me to do so?

Mr. QUEZON. All right.

Mr. TOWNER. I move to strike out the word "four," in line 6, and in lieu thereof insert the words "six and three years, respectively."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 13, line 6, by striking out the word "four" and inserting the words "six and three years, respectively."

Mr. TOWNER. This is in accordance with the action we have taken before.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I suppose that will not confuse the matter. Now there is a provision that one-half of the senators elected only hold for three years—

Mr. TOWNER. That provision, the gentleman will understand, refers to the first election.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I understand that.

Mr. TOWNER. So there will be no confusion at all, I think.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman has thoroughly considered that and is satisfied in his own mind now about it, I am willing to accept it.

Mr. TOWNER. I would like for the gentleman himself to consider it, as well.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, I have just this moment received two cablegrams from the Philippines, the contents of which ought to fill every patriotic American, regardless of his political affiliation, with joy and pride. One year ago this month a new Governor General for the Philippine Islands arrived in Manila, and was there met with a very warm and enthusiastic reception by thousands upon thousands of people,



many of whom came from the farthest corners of the archipelago. This Governor General was the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, of New York, formerly a distinguished Member of this House and now the chief executive of the Philippine Islands. [Applause.] Arches, bands of music, waving flags, and fragrant flowers spoke of the good will and the high expectations of the people of the Philippines regarding their new Governor General. What was the meaning of this magnificent and unprecedented reception given to a foreign governor. Was it, perhaps, that at last the Filipino people had forsaken their desire to be the masters of their own destinies and were actually glad to receive a foreign ruler? No; the Filipino people were then as much as they had ever been—indeed, as much as they are to-day—united in their aspiration to have as their chief executive a man of their own kind and of their own free selection. But they had heard of Gov. Gen. Harrison before; they had read some of the remarks made by him upon this floor, when he was still a Member of this House, touching upon the Philippines, and they knew thereby that Gov. Harrison had accepted the Governor Generalship of the Islands for no purpose other than that of helping the Filipino people to harvest the precious fruit of their patriotic endeavors as well as to do his part in bringing about the early redemption of the pledge of his own people to give the islands their own government. So the Filipino people looked upon the incoming Governor General from the very moment when they learned of his appointment not as their new ruler, but rather as their adviser, friend, and advocate. And so they received him with open arms and loving hearts.

The Filipino people have not been disappointed in Gov. Gen. Harrison. He has almost surpassed our expectations. During the year which has just elapsed since the day he landed on Philippine shores he has given us ample evidence that he is an able, efficient, sympathetic, and just executive and administrator; a sincere friend of our country, earnestly striving to promote its welfare and its liberty. For this reason, upon the anniversary of the governor's arrival at Manila, there was a great public demonstration, equal to if not surpassing in its display of affectionate feeling the one given him upon his arrival.

I shall read, Mr. Chairman, these cablegrams I hold in my hand, for they will tell better than I could myself of what took place in Manila. One cablegram reads:

Over 50,000 Filipinos from every walk in life and irrespective of political affiliations marched to-day to Malacanang Palace to celebrate the first anniversary of the arrival of Gov. Harrison. A delegation from the people presented the governor with an album containing a signed resolution, requesting President Wilson to keep Mr. Harrison as Governor General until the Philippine policy of the President, as outlined in his message to the Filipino people, delivered through Gov. Harrison last year, has been carried out, and conveying to Gov. Harrison the confidence and faith of the Filipino people in their governor, as well as commending his untiring and successful efforts to carry out the President's policy. Gov. Harrison addressed the gathering briefly, as follows:

"Your presence in such great numbers does me honor far beyond my deserts, but more important still you once more display the good will and confidence of the people of the Philippines toward the people of the United States. Our people are your friends, and they are proud of your progress and your accomplishments. As the representative of the United States, I desire most earnestly to merit your continued friendship and cooperation. Both these you have already shown me in unmeasured terms.

"One year ago I delivered to you a message from President Wilson. He then authorized me to say, 'We regard ourselves as trustees acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for that independence.' To both of these principles I now reaffirm my unyielding allegiance. To both these principles I have adhered during this past year with unfaltering determination. To both I shall continue to adhere. And in this determination you have rendered me your assistance in every way. With patience, with dignity, and with wisdom you have justified the words of President Wilson toward you. The year has been one in which Filipinos may well take pride—not only the few in office but the great mass of the people as well. In the future you will tread with ever-increasing powers of self-government the same path of moderation, of justice, and of progress. Let us continue to work together united and in harmony."

Another says that a committee, composed of representative Filipinos from every walk in life and of delegations from all the most important social associations in the Philippines, adopted the following resolution:

Whereas the benefits of good laws and liberal constitution are only shared by the people through the faithful execution of these laws and the mandates of said constitution by executives jealous of the strict compliance of their duties: and

Whereas the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, Governor General of the Philippine Islands, ever since his assumption of office has faithfully interpreted and executed not only the laws and the constitution of the Philippine Islands but also the policy of the President of the United States, as outlined in his message to the Filipino people and conveyed to them by said Gov. Gen. Harrison, so much so that he has brought to the public mind the conviction that there now exists in these islands a government that protects life and liberty and promotes prosperity alike to the natives and to the foreigners, the undersigned representing the people of Manila and neighboring Provinces—

Resolved, First, that a visit be paid to said Governor General, the Hon. Francis Burton Harrison, at Malacanang Palace at 4 p. m. on the 11th

day of October, in order to give him a public and official testimony of the great satisfaction that the people of the Philippine Islands feel for his upright and wise administration.

Second. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Philippine Commission and the Philippine Assembly.

Third. That copies of this resolution be sent to the Resident Commissioners in the United States, with the request that they communicate the same to the Congress and to the President of the United States and state at the same time the ardent desire of the people of the Philippines that said Hon. Francis Burton Harrison remain as chief executive of these islands.

Fourth. That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Governor General, Francis Burton Harrison, written in an album and signed by the executive committee and other representative persons who may wish to do so.

Mr. Chairman, it is only natural that the Filipino people should thus feel toward their present Governor General. They owe it to him, since he has under the most difficult circumstances succeeded in giving them an efficient and very satisfactory government. The first anniversary of Mr. Harrison's administration shows a reduction in the expenses of the Philippine Government, as compared with the last six months of the preceding calendar year, of \$2,000,000 per annum, out of a total expenditure which had been in the past slightly less than \$15,000,000 per annum. Nearly one-half of this great saving had been effected in the expenses of bureaus and offices, and represented real economy in that it showed a reduction in the "overhead" cost of administering the affairs of the islands.

A portion of the governor's first message to the Philippine Legislature was devoted to a description of the financial difficulties which the insular government was facing upon his arrival. The saving effected, as I have already indicated, shows how great an effort and how much courage and determination were necessary to accomplish this great reduction in the expenses of the government. I shall not detain the House by reading this message, but the American people should be acquainted with it, and therefore I shall insert it in this part of my remarks. The message referred to is as follows:

#### ANNUAL MESSAGE.

Gentlemen of the legislature, for the first time since the occupation of the Philippine Islands by the United States a Democratic administration assumed control of the United States Government upon the 4th of last March. Ten days ago, as the representative of that administration, I came to you as your chief executive bearing a message from President Woodrow Wilson. That message, indicating the policy of the President in respect to these islands, I have already delivered to the Philippine people in his name.

The President has promised that he will give immediately to the people of the Philippines, as the first step toward carrying out his policy, a majority of the appointive commission. This legislature will, therefore, for the first time have a majority of native citizens in both branches. In consequence the eyes of the American people will be upon this legislature with a confident expectation that it will furnish to the world a proof that you are capable of self-government and that it will measurably advance the day of independence.

You begin your labors at a time of profound peace throughout the islands. It is our duty to conserve it.

#### GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS.

Every legitimate business enterprise should and will receive the protection of the Insular Government. But we must bear in mind that business is intended to serve the Government, not the Government to serve business. The duty of government is to see that every business man receives an equal opportunity before the law, not that any business man should enjoy a special privilege.

The best service that a government can properly render to commercial enterprise is to restore confidence and to promote good feeling. If the new administration here shall be the instrument of bringing about a better understanding between the different elements of the community, it will be promoting the best interests of the business world. Good feeling between all classes of residents in the islands is the best asset of a business community. It should be our duty and it will be my constant preoccupation to leave nothing untended to bring about this happy result.

Before proceeding to a discussion of any other matter, I submit for your consideration a report recently made by the former secretary of the Interior of this Government upon the subject of slavery.

#### DEFICIT DEMANDS ECONOMY.

My term of service in this Government has been short. I am not at this moment prepared to advise with you upon all subjects of public interest. At a future day I shall ask your indulgence to send to you other messages upon matters of public moment. For the present I direct your attention to one special subject in my judgment of paramount importance.

The most pressing need of the hour is economy in the public expenditures. This matter, in my opinion, is the most important question now affecting the success and welfare of this Government. Based upon the estimates of probable receipts and expenditures for the current fiscal year, as published by the auditor, it is probable that the Government, without the adoption of a drastic program of economy is face to face with a deficit of about four and a half million pesos.

From June 30, 1908, when the surplus in the Insular treasury was \$17,499,894.97, the surplus has fallen as of June 30, 1913, to \$14,230,220.23. Of this sum, however, about \$5,000,000 is only nominally available, it being invested in supplies and having been carried to the surplus account in 1911, thus leaving an actual cash surplus in hand at the conclusion of the last fiscal year of only about \$9,000,000.

This shrinkage in the available surplus of the Government has come about notwithstanding the fact that during this period of four years the sum of \$6,000,000 has been obtained by the sale of an issue of public works bonds, and expended out of the treasury, and notwithstanding the further fact that a little less than three and a half million pesos from the gold standard fund has during this period passed through the treasury in the same way.

At the present rate the auditor on June 30, 1913, estimated that the current expenditures of this Government would exceed the income by about \$2,000,000 in the course of the fiscal year. In this connection it



is fair to say that the insular collector of customs, in making his estimate to the auditor, properly discounted the fact that owing to the limited importation of rice the custom revenues would fall, and they actually have fallen in the first two months about \$1,600,000. It is also fair to state that the estimates made at the same time by the collector of internal revenue were probably exaggerated when he predicted an increase of about \$1,000,000 in internal revenue; in any event it is certain that this expected increase has not only failed to materialize thus far, but that we are actually running behind the internal-revenue receipts of the preceding fiscal year in a sum which for the first three months has exceeded \$100,000. This decrease may possibly be offset by the collection of the new income tax.

While it is possible that the income from customs may improve somewhat from the present date, approximately \$3,000,000 may be figured as the probable deficit based upon the ordinary income and expenditure of the government for the present year. To this we must add the sum of \$1,500,000 of which the treasury is to be deprived in the balance of the current year by the passage of the Underwood tariff bill, which removes the tax upon exports.

#### COMMENTS UNDERWOOD BILL.

Too much can not be said in commendation of the Underwood tariff bill in its relation to the Philippine Islands. Not only does this act remove the limitations imposed by the Payne law upon the amount of sugar, tobacco, and rice which may be exported free to the United States, but in removing the export tax upon such commodities as hemp, copra, and sugar a heavy burden of taxation is lifted from the shoulders of the farmers of the Philippine Islands, and an immediate increase in their prosperity is confidently expected as a result of this measure.

Our treasury is therefore obviously approaching a point where a deficit of \$4,500,000 confronts us. How, then, shall we avoid this deficit and restore the finances of our government to a normal and self-supporting condition? In my judgment but one course is open to us. I can not offer to you the possibility of an issue of public bonds to recoup the treasury. However much justification might be found in the eyes of some for a bond issue for some work of great public importance, no argument can support, under any system of government, a bond issue to meet current expenses. Indeed, a bond issue to recoup a falling treasury is tantamount to a confession of bankruptcy. Even if we could hope to secure congressional action upon an application for such an issue of bonds we would be condemned in the eyes of other nations for a failure to manage our affairs here upon a sound and conservative basis.

I repeat, then, only one course lies before us, and that is economy of the most drastic kind. In considering the question of economy I urge upon the members of the legislature that they approach this subject in a spirit of cooperation and self-sacrifice. It may be that for the time being partial cessation of some of the public works will be required, and this may bring temporary disappointment to certain localities in the islands, but it is my earnest hope and intention that as soon as the treasury can be restored to a sound basis, the public works shall go forward uninterrupted and with renewed zeal.

A considerable burden is also laid upon the treasury by the large proportion of American employees in this Government. While the enunciated policy has been to reduce this number as rapidly as possible consistent with the demands of fairness and efficiency, the last annual report of the bureau of civil service shows that there were more Americans having a permanent status in the Philippine civil service in 1912 than in any previous year since 1905. At the present time no further civil-service employees should be brought here from the United States to fill purely clerical positions, nor in any event except where special requirements may make such course necessary.

#### TOP-HEAVY BUREAUCRACY.

These islands have need of a simple and scientific form of government. Instead of that, we find a complicated and top-heavy system of bureaucracy. Much can be done toward simplifying this bureau form of government, and in this connection I invite your consideration to the possibility of a reduction in the number of the bureaus by consolidation or otherwise. It has also been suggested that some of the salaries of the higher Government officials are disproportionate to the size of the insular revenues. When you proceed to a discussion of this question, I strongly recommend to you that no change be in any event effected in the judicial salaries, nor in the salaries of employees who are receiving \$5,000 or less. We find, moreover, that as an incident to highly centralized bureaucratic government a number of offices have been created and salaries have been raised without what seems to me to have been due authority of law; and as further inevitable result of bureaucracy, here as elsewhere, too many offices now exist. You are invited to scrutinize the bureaus of this Government with an eye to economy in that respect.

A further and perhaps considerable saving might be effected by a change in our method of appropriations; good usage elsewhere commands to us a system of direct treasury appropriations.

In this connection it is my hope that previous differences of opinion between the two houses may now be removed. This legislature, which meets to-day, should proceed to its work with a determination that the two houses will act in harmony, and that the necessary supply bills of the Government may become law by the joint will of the legislature instead of through the individual fiat of the executive.

#### ON TRIAL.

The present financial condition of this treasury calls for action of the highest order of self-denial and patriotism on the part of this legislature. The President has promised you a majority in the upper house, so that you may have control of both branches of your legislature. In doing this he placed upon you the responsibility to show to the whole world your capacity to legislate. Here at the outset a severe trial is upon you. I call upon each member of this legislature to do his share in the work which I have outlined. I do this assured that in this first and perhaps most severe test to which your honorable body will be subjected you will prove entirely worthy of the confidence placed in you by the President of the United States.

Great and commendable as is the work done by Gov. Gen. Harrison in the direction I have described, it is not all nor is it the most important of his achievements within a very short period of time. When he came to the islands the Filipino people were beginning to doubt their insular administrators. Ever since the beginning of the American administration, and in accord with the celebrated instructions of President McKinley, Governors General have been promising to place Filipinos in

the appointive positions of that government as soon and as fast as they could show themselves capable of filling those positions. Yet in his report for 1909 Gov. Gen. Forbes, speaking of the bureau of civil service, said that the progress made in increasing the proportion of Filipino employees was not satisfactory. Gov. Gen. Harrison found that in 1912, as shown in the report of the bureau of civil service for that year, there were more Americans having a permanent status in the Philippine service than in any previous year since 1905. Gov. Gen. Harrison came forward with the fearless purpose of redeeming the pledges of his predecessors as much as with that of carrying out the policies of the President and making his own desires effective. He therefore began to appoint Filipinos to responsible positions, and his early action on this score at once revived the declining faith of the people of the Philippine Islands in the protestations of the previous Governors General. Both the policies of economy and that of doing justice to the Filipino people provoked a storm of criticism on the part of the necessary victims of such a policy, and Gov. Gen. Harrison was accused of disorganizing the Philippine Government, of disregarding the civil-service rules, and of using the methods of the ward politician. An article purporting to be an interview with Gov. Gen. Harrison saw the light in a Honolulu newspaper. This was quoted and re-quoted and several times reprinted to show that Gov. Gen. Harrison was an ordinary politician, to be ranked with those who believe in and practice the spoils system in its most extreme form. One of the most notorious occasions on which use was made of this supposed interview was the citation of it by ex-Secretary Dean C. Worcester, formerly of the Philippine Government, in his book entitled "The Philippines—Past and Present," published after the Philippine Islands had been relieved of his authority. On page 377 of his book I quote the following:

While in Honolulu, en route to Manila, Mr. Harrison gave out an interview, which I am credibly informed he has since confirmed in substance. It contained the following statements:

"For years I have been of the minority in Congress, and have seen the Democrats kicked about, trampled upon, and otherwise manhandled by Republicans, so that I must confess it now gives me a saturnine pleasure to see the Democrats in a position to do the same thing to the Republicans."

His early official acts after arrival at Manila confirmed the belief that this was indeed the spirit in which he was facing the great responsibility which there confronted him.

It is beyond doubt or cavil that high ideals heretofore have prevailed in the Philippine civil service. Are they now to be substituted by the methods of the ward politician?

I do not know who was this credible informant of Mr. Worcester. But ever since he began his attack upon Gov. Gen. Harrison he has been disseminating so much of the same "credible information" which proved afterwards to be absolutely unreliable that it makes no difference who this particular informant is. I received a cablegram some time ago from Gov. Gen. Harrison in answer to one of inquiry from me positively denying that he had ever made such statements. I did not need to ask him, and I hope the Governor knew that I did not cable him for that purpose, in order to assure myself that he did not grant such an interview. I have the honor of knowing personally the motives that inspired Gov. Gen. Harrison in accepting the Governor Generalship of the Philippine Islands. I saw what he did following his assumption of office, and I was therefore fully aware that the alleged interview was a falsehood—the mere invention of an unscrupulous reporter. But I sent this cablegram to the Governor in order to be able to say that he positively and directly repudiated the interview.

The truth is that the methods of Gov. Gen. Harrison in matters of appointment are absolutely free not only from any justified charge but even from any appearance of justification that he has employed the methods of—in the words of Mr. Worcester—"a ward politician." Gov. Gen. Harrison has not given positions in the Philippine Government to personal friends. He has not brought with him relatives to do business in the islands or to engage in agriculture on lands rented or purchased from the Philippine Government, and this dignified conduct of the Governor is the more praiseworthy since he is the first Governor General of the islands, who was previously a Member of Congress, and had therefore many political friends, a circumstance which doubtless has on more than one occasion put to a test his integrity of character and devotion to duty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The all-embracing activity of our Governor General made it possible for him not only to reduce the expenses of the Philippine Government, not only to relieve that government of unnecessary officials, not only to give to the Filipinos such posts as they should immediately have, but also to dispose of every question that required immediate attention and to inaugurate a successful system of government for the non-Christian tribes,



which before his attempt had been looked to as sure to produce dreadful effects. Gov. Gen. Harrison has practically solved the so-called Moro problem. The Filipinos professing the Mohammedan religion and inhabiting the islands of Jolo and western and central parts of Mindanao have given continuous trouble to the American Government. They were never actually under the control of Spain, and it had been stated that said Filipinos who are called Moros could be governed only by a strong military force that must be composed primarily of Americans. There were suggestions that, in the words of an old saying, somewhat adapted, "The only good Moro is the dead Moro." At all events, it was most emphatically asserted that they could not be governed by a civil governor. In consultation with the Army commanders of the Philippines and of the War Department, Gov. Gen. Harrison substituted a civil for the military government of the Moro Province before he was two months in Manila, and to-day a new law has already been enacted that has reorganized the government of that country, with the result that there is to-day complete tranquillity and peace among these supposedly indomitable people; with the further result that there are more schools and better sanitation among them, and with the crowning result that twice as much land was under the plow on March 31, 1914, as there was when Gov. Carpenter, of the Moro Province, was inaugurated in November or December of last year. The other non-Christian inhabitants of the Philippines have also been properly dealt with. It was the old policy to isolate them from the Christian Filipinos. There were indications that this was done with no very sane purpose. At any rate, it was a most unreasonable plan, sure to accomplish, whether so meant or not, the development in the Philippines of a people within another people, differing in ideas and customs with, if not antagonistic to, the latter. It retarded the development of the former by depriving them of intercommunication with their more advanced and civilized brethren. Gov. Gen. Harrison, in consultation and in accord with the able and industrious secretary of the interior, Hon. Winfred T. Denison, has reversed that policy and has inaugurated a new one, by which contact between the Christians and non-Christians is brought about and a more intimate relation is created, while more attention is given to their education and to their health. The secretary of the interior, in his instructions to his delegate for the government of the non-Christians, said:

You shall endeavor to make yourself in good truth the unifier, tearing down as rapidly as possible the walls which have isolated the non-Christians from the Christians.

Gov. Gen. Harrison has not only merited the love of the Filipinos themselves, but the applause of his superiors—the Secretary of War and the President. Upon the passage of the first appropriation bill enacted by the Philippine Legislature, in accord with the suggestion of the Governor General in his message, to which I have before referred, the President sent him a cablegram expressing his appreciation for his successful administration, and the Secretary of War sent him the following message:

I congratulate you upon the passage for the first time in three years of a general appropriation bill and on the fact that the bill was passed unanimously by both houses. I have no doubt but that there were, as to a great many features, differences of opinion, but it is a source of satisfaction to the department that such differences were satisfactorily adjusted. Please extend to both houses of the Philippine Legislature my congratulations on this event and express to them my hope that this is but an indication of what may be expected in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I shall no longer detain the House with this topic, though I am sure, from the close attention with which the committee has heard me, that the Members are glad to hear of the wonderful accomplishments of a dear friend and once their colleague. I want to say only one other word, and I mean it for every American interested in the Philippine Islands. The Filipinos owe to Gov. Gen. Harrison a debt of gratitude that they can never pay. He has served as faithfully as the most intelligent and patriotic of their own people or of their own selection could have done. He has served disinterestedly, devotedly, and untiringly. May God grant that he remain at the head of our government, representing this great Nation there, until the day shall have arrived when the Filipino people may elect his successor. But Gov. Gen. Harrison has not only served, not even mainly served, the people of the Philippine Islands; he has also served his own people, the people of the United States. He has served them both in a practical way and in furthering their ideals of government. He has served them in a practical way because the policies of Gov. Gen. Harrison, his gentleness and justness in dealing with the Filipino people, have made the Filipinos better friends of the Americans. To-day the American employee, the American business man, is better liked and better helped by the Filipinos. He has served them in furthering the ideals of this Government, as the Governor General himself stated it in

his speech at the banquet of welcome tendered him the night of his arrival in Manila. These are his own words:

Standing here before this flag, to which I, in common with you, owe allegiance, and of which I am proud, I pledge to you that the best service that I can render to my country is to render service to the best aspirations of the people of the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Chairman, I entertain the hope that the day will sometime arrive when the arrival of Gov. Gen. Harrison in the Philippines will be celebrated as one of our national holidays. [Applause.]

In connection with my remarks, I wish to print the following interview given by the Secretary of War, which was published in the Christian Science Monitor, and also a short quotation from a very responsible newspaper in the United States, that may give the keynote to the attacks made upon Gov. Gen. Harrison:

Mr. Secretary, you were quoted the other day as saying that a good many misstatements were being printed about the situation in the Philippines, and that you would like the people to get information that is accurate and truthfully reveals conditions. I would like very much to have certain points cleared up.

Answer. I will be very pleased to give you any information you want about the Philippines.

Question. Has the criticism of the Harrison administration been unusually severe?

Answer. If you will look back through your files and that of other leading newspapers, you will find that it has not been, compared to the criticism which has met every change of the past in the islands. Every change or step taken by the American Government has been met with a great deal of criticism and much loose talk, and you will find that most of such statements were untrue and much of the criticism and condemnation without foundation in fact.

Question. This is interesting, Mr. Secretary, in view of the impression sought to be created that in the past all was fair sailing in the Philippines, and no breeze of adverse criticism had rippled the seas. May I ask what were the subjects of adverse criticism?

Answer. You will recall the bitter criticisms of the conduct of our Army in suppressing insurrection; the criticism that civil government was established too soon, while the "iron hand" was still necessary to enduring peace; that the civil government was extravagant and incompetent; that it favored a policy of exploitation ruinous to the natives and in the interest of a few Americans. These are but a few of the subjects which one recalls without the need of investigation and without looking up the records.

Question. I am told that the present criticisms are entitled to greater weight because of the fact that in the past the criticisms had their origin in America, while the present criticisms are an echo of the American press in the islands and are based on statements of persons fresh from the islands. Is that so?

Answer. It is true that the American press criticisms are but echoes of the American press in the islands and a repetition of statements made by those returning from the islands. It is not true that this was otherwise in the past.

The attack on Mr. Taft following his formulation of the motto: "The Philippines for the Filipinos," was most bitter in the American press of Manila. Mr. Taft was represented by that press to be the most unpopular American in the islands.

His reply to this criticism in his speech before the Union Reading College, Manila, P. I., on December 17, 1903, has given the record of this feeling at that time a permanent place in the history of the government of the islands. The speech would serve, with few changes, to reply to present critics, including Mr. Taft, Mr. Worcester, and others. The basis of present criticisms is identical and the source is the same.

Later, the criticisms of Gov. Forbes were quite as bitter in the Philippine-American press as in the United States, the only difference between the cases of Gov. Forbes and Mr. Taft being that the press differed in the Forbes controversy, while it was unanimous in abusing Mr. Taft.

Question. What do you think produces this spirit of attack, and why should this be so?

Answer. Well, for one reason, of course, any who have been displaced always make a lot of noise and get their friends interested in condemning those in authority. Furthermore, there is a unique situation out there in this: There are Americans in business there, and when changes are made in the heads of the Government they, of course, desire to establish some form of intimate relations; and very often when they find that they are not being consulted either as frequently or as intimately as they think they should be, they retaliate by unfounded condemnation and general damning of the new officials. Or where, as on one occasion in the past, there has been a feeling that the Governor General was too friendly with one section of the American public, the criticism was even greater.

Question. Has there been any unusual dismissals of American employees under the Harrison administration?

Answer. No; the number of dismissals has not been unusual. It has increased slightly, due to necessary retrenchment. The number, however, is not one-half of what it was in years like 1903 and 1904, nor so great as it was in 1905 and 1906, when there was an effort at retrenchment.

Question. What is there in the charge that the civil-service rules have been disregarded? How many Americans, all told, has Gov. Harrison taken out to the Philippines and put into positions there?

Answer. Not a single instance has been brought to my attention where it was charged that Gov. Harrison had disregarded civil-service rules. Fewer Americans have been taken to the islands during Gov. Gen. Harrison's administration than during any similar period in recent years.

Of Americans coming from the United States since his arrival he has appointed the collector of customs, one member of the municipal board of the city of Manila, and one member of the public utilities commission.

Question. What are the important positions to which the Governor General might, if he so desired, appoint his American political friends?

Answer. First, the chiefs of bureaus of the Government, of which there are about 22. Second, the judges of first instance in the islands, of which there are 38. All of these judicial positions have been filled by appointment since Gov. Harrison arrived in the islands. Third, miscellaneous appointments, such as the members of the municipal board of



the city of Manila, governor of the department of Mindanao and Sulu, and members of the public utilities commission.

Question. Now, Mr. Secretary, in how many of these has the Governor actually appointed Americans brought by him from the United States?

Answer. Of the heads of the bureaus of the Philippine Government Gov. Harrison appointed one—the collector of customs—from the United States—Dr. Herstein. Dr. Herstein had been an employee of the United States civil service for some years. He was a tariff expert employed in the framing of the recent United States tariff. His politics are not known to me.

He appointed, as a member of the municipal board of the city of Manila, Dr. Fitzsimmons, who had served in the islands formerly.

He appointed, as a member of the public utilities commission, Stephen Bonsal, a well-known American newspaper and literary man.

He reappointed every judge of first instance on the bench, and in filling the remaining vacancies he selected two Americans, one of whom had been long in the service of the islands and one who had been in the islands only a short time in the civil service, but had previously been in the civil service of the United States.

Question. What basis is there for the statement that business is disorganized in the islands and that the economic conditions are upset?

Answer. About as much basis as there is for such a statement with reference to the United States. It is perfectly well known to anyone who is searching for the truth that there has been a world-wide business depression, and that while in particular communities this depression may have been enhanced or mitigated by local conditions, this has only been in the matter of degree. In the Philippines, due to the exclusively agricultural basis of business, this depression has been least. Unquestionably, some business men wished to know the course that this administration proposed to pursue before they embarked in any extension of their business enterprises. But to suggest seriously that there has been any panicky condition produced in the Philippines by anything that this Government has done or left undone is simply to state that which has not the basis of truth.

Question. But it has been said that there has been an immense falling in the imports into the islands, showing a lack of confidence in business conditions?

Answer. That the imports into the Philippines are, when analyzed, an indication of business conditions and confidence, or the lack thereof, is to an extent true.

However, one of the imports which varies most from year to year is rice. The importation of rice in large quantities is an indication of the failure of the local rice crop and, contrary to the general rule, its importation in large quantities is an indication rather of local distress than of a healthy condition.

The fiscal year 1912, i. e., the year ending June 30, 1912, was, measured by the total of imports, the most prosperous year up to that time in the history of the Philippines. The total imports were \$54,549,980. But the dark spot was that of this total \$10,519,949 was rice, the result of an unusually disastrous failure of the Philippine rice crop.

In the fiscal year 1913 the total imports showed an increase over the preceding year to \$56,327,583, though the imports of rice were but \$7,940,857.

The reports of Philippine commerce have now been received to include the month of May, 1914. I give the following from the records for purposes of comparison:

Total imports for 11 months ending May, 1912.....	\$48,522,580
Total imports for 11 months ending May, 1913.....	51,543,134
Total for 11 months ending May, 1914.....	50,876,025

For the same periods, omitting rice:

1912.....	\$39,731,895
1913.....	43,825,329
1914.....	48,395,180

Of the total during these three periods there were from the United States:

1912.....	\$18,560,805
1913.....	23,130,695
1914.....	25,752,233

In the face of this it is idle to talk of depression or lack of confidence.

Question. As a matter of fact, has the administration taken any radical step of any kind in the Philippines; and if so, what; and what effect do you think this has had?

Answer. As a matter of fact, the administration has not only taken no radical step, but has not done anything except in good faith pursue the policy which has been announced to the Filipinos from the very beginning. All of the American Governors have promised them to put them into governmental positions just as soon as they were capable of performing the duties; that is, to bring about the so-called Filipinization of the service. You will find references and promises of this character in the reports and public utterances of every Governor General.

President Taft, when chairman of the Philippine Commission, and afterwards when Civil Governor, inaugurated this treatment of the Filipinos pursuant to specific instructions of President McKinley. In doing this he met with just the same storm of abuse which is now revived against Harrison. I have just recently seen a speech made by him in which he alludes at great length to this matter in vindication of his position. Referring to the invitation to make the address, Mr. Taft then said:

"The civil government was just then receiving even more criticism than usual from the young lions of the Manila press."

Later he says:

"Some of our young lions of the local press have spoken of the 'childish slogan: The Philippines for the Filipinos.' It is unnecessary to comment on the adjective used, but it is sufficient to say that, whether childish or not, the principle makes up the web and the woof of the policy of the United States with respect to those islands, as it has been authoritatively declared by two Presidents of the United States—for President Roosevelt has followed sedulously the policy of President McKinley—and by the interpretation of the supreme popular will, the Congress of the United States."

And again:

"There are many Americans in these islands, possibly a majority—and this includes all the American press—who are strongly opposed to the doctrine of 'the Philippines for the Filipinos.' They have no patience with the policy of attraction, no patience with attempts to conciliate the Filipino people, no patience with the introduction into the government as rapidly as their fitness justifies of the prominent Filipinos. They resent everything in the government that is not

American. They insist that there is a necessity for a firm government here rather than a popular one, and that the welfare of Americans and American trade should be regarded as paramount."

And with reference to the then attitude of the American press and merchants of the city of Manila, he said:

"The attitude of the American press and of the American merchant in his hostility to the Filipino, and in the consequent hostility to the civil government, was led into the error at one time of emphasizing in every possible way, by letters and representations of all sorts, that the condition of the country as to tranquillity was so bad that the whole of the islands was still in a state of war. Every small ladrone fight, every discomfiture which the constabulary suffered, was exaggerated and made the basis for inference that the conditions in the country were retrograding rather than improving. Such incidents were seized upon and made as much of as headlines and general statements could make them."

And with reference to its attitude toward the Filipino, he said:

"When one's feelings of enmity are very much aroused it is difficult to set the limit to the expression of them. So it is that we have the young lions of the American press, of the three newspapers who are supposed to speak the American public opinion in these islands, holding the Filipino up to contempt, exposing all his supposed vices, and giving him no credit whatever for any virtues, and it may be that this represents the feeling of the majority of the resident Americans in Manila. But can we not, in the end, be just and give to the whole Filipino people their due? Should we wish the Filipino people to judge of Americans by the drunken, truculent American loafers who infest the small towns of these islands, living on the fruits of the labor of Filipino women, and give us more trouble than any other element in the islands? Should we wish the Filipino people to judge American standards of honesty by reading the humiliating list of American official and unofficial defaulters in these islands? I think not."

After reviewing the reiterated promises of the American Government in the islands and of the Presidents of the United States to look solely to the welfare of the Philippine Islands, Mr. Taft said again:

"Again, one of the conditions indispensable to progress is tranquillity. Without it capital, constitutionally timid, will not come. Now what has produced the present tranquillity? I say without hesitation that the chief element to-day is the confidence which the conservative people of the islands have in the promise of the United States to make the welfare of the Filipinos its chief purpose in remaining here and to assist them sincerely in learning the secret of self-government by gradually enlarging their political power."

And then:

"How long is it thought we could avail ourselves of this popular support if we repudiated our national promises and adopted the policy of repulsion and repression, dignified under the name 'the policy of a firm hand,' and if we said to the people, 'You are not to be trusted; the offices must all go to Americans; you are an inferior race and are sufficiently rewarded by having a superior race to come here and run your government for you?'"

And, finally, with reference to the policy of the American Government, he said:

"What do the young lions of the American press in Manila, what do the merchants of Manila who take the position I have attempted to explain and describe, expect to do? Do they expect to change the policy of the Government? Certainly not, as long as the Government of the United States is alive to the honor of preserving sacred its promises to a whole people. From where do they expect the political support that can be effective to carry out the policy which their attitude indicates? The policy of the present civil government in placing as its first aim the promotion of the welfare and the prosperity of the Filipino people and the gradual extension to them of self-government is the identical policy of the Republican Party as shown in its platform of 1900."

Question. To what do you attribute this apparent purpose of misleading the American public about the real situation?

Answer. Very largely to those who were fearful of some radical action on the part of the administration, which they thought would be disastrous to their own interests and to those who, not swayed by self-interest, feared that such action would be detrimental to the best interests of the islands and this country. That is to say, the fear that, without sufficient investigation and without careful consideration, this administration would cut all bonds between this country and the Philippine Islands and leave them to start as a national entity without any further guidance and control. If they had taken counsel of facts and not of their fears, they would not have started upon any such campaign. I do not think I am mistaken in believing that those who were the leaders in this clamor against Gov. Harrison would now, in view of all the facts, gladly destroy the record which they have made for themselves. Unfortunately many who have accepted these statements as facts have not the same means of ascertaining the truth, and now accept as facts what these leaders proclaimed from their fears and now have not the courage to deny.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what has been the policy of this administration toward the Philippines?

Answer. President Wilson plainly marked out our attitude toward the Philippines upon two occasions: First, when he authorized Gov. Harrison in his inaugural address to make the following statement:

"We regard ourselves as trustees, acting not for the advantage of the United States, but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands. Every step we take will be taken with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands and as a preparation for their independence; and we hope to move toward that end as rapidly as the safety and the permanent interests of the islands will permit. After each step taken experience will guide us to the next. The administration will take one step at once. It will give to the native citizens of the islands a majority in the appointive commission, and thus in the upper as well as in the lower house of the legislature. It will do this in the confident hope and expectation that immediate proof will thereby be given in the action of the commission under the new arrangement of the political capacity of those native citizens who have already come forward to represent and lead their people in affairs."

Second, in his next annual message to Congress, in which he said as follows:

"No doubt we shall successfully enough bind Porto Rico and the Hawaiian Islands to ourselves by ties of justice and interest and affection, but the performance of our duty toward the Philippines is a more difficult and debatable matter. We can satisfy the obligations of generous justice toward the people of Porto Rico by giving them the ample and familiar rights and privileges accorded our own citizens in our own Territories and our obligations toward the people of Hawaii by perfecting the provisions for self-government already granted them,



but in the Philippines we must go further. We must hold steadily in view their ultimate independence, and we must move toward the time of that independence as steadily as the way can be cleared and the foundations thoughtfully and permanently laid.

"Acting under the authority conferred upon the President by Congress, I have already accorded the people of the islands a majority in both houses of their legislative body by appointing five instead of four native citizens to the membership of the commission. I believe that in this way we shall make proof of their capacity in counsel and their sense of responsibility in the exercise of political power, and that the success of this step will be sure to clear our view for the steps which are to follow. Step by step we should extend and perfect the system of self-government in the islands, making test of them and modifying them as experience discloses their successes and their failures; that we should more and more put under the control of the native citizens of the archipelago the essential instruments of their life, their local instrumentalities of government, their schools, all the common interests of their communities, and so by counsel and experience set up a government which all the world will see to be suitable to a people whose affairs are under their own control. At last, I hope and believe, we are beginning to gain the confidence of the Filipino peoples. By their counsel and experience, rather than by our own, we shall learn how best to serve them and how soon it will be possible and wise to withdraw our supervision. Let us once find the path and set out with firm and competent tread upon it, and we shall not wander from it or linger upon it.

Since it is the conceded fact that from the very beginning the American people, speaking through their representatives, have always disclaimed any intention to incorporate the Philippines as part of the American body politic, and since it has always been treated as only a question of time when they should have some form of national autonomy, the real matter to be considered by statesmen and by citizens who wish to do what is right is how to proceed in the matter so as to reach a just conclusion. This administration has proceeded along the line of experience, which, as the old adage tells us, is the best school; I think I would say practically the only useful school. The experiment which we made initially, as outlined in the quoted declaration of the President, has not only not proven unwise, but has proven very wise.

The next step to be taken, as provided in the pending Jones bill, is to give them further autonomous power; that is, to give them more participation in managing their own affairs, with, however, such reservations of guidance and control to the Federal Government as to enable it to see that no harm comes.

Question. What, in your judgment, will likely be the effect of this measure, if enacted into law, upon the Filipinos?

Answer. I can not see how it can be other than very favorable. The Filipinos who have sufficient knowledge and ability to deal with the subject realize that until they demonstrate their ability to operate successfully a government in all of its manifold and complex aspects it would be unthinkable that the United States would be justified in withdrawing from its position of trusteeship. The only way in which they can demonstrate their capacity is after trial. Any body of citizenship which has not been accustomed to exercising governmental functions must become accustomed thereto before it can successfully do so. It is known historically that the Philippine people for centuries have not been governing themselves. It is not to be wondered at that they can not immediately evoke the public opinion which is necessary to all successful self-governments. The coherent and cohesive aggregation of public opinion is the result of training; and those who have the best interests of the Filipinos at heart, both natives and those of our country, realize that they must be given the opportunity to cultivate and cause to grow up the necessary patriotic cooperation before they can have a successful self-controlled government. What we have in view is to make the conditions favorable for the growth of that sort of patriotic cooperation, the linking together of these nationals, with a view of eventually finding in that country such a condition as makes likely the success of self-government.

We have done that which we think was wise and conservative and thoughtful to take the next step in laying the groundwork for this hoped-for eventual condition.

[From the St. Louis Mirror, December 12, 1913.]

Gov. Gen. Harrison is evidently trying to find out things from Filipinos, not from bureaucrats who have been living on the people. This is in line with the policy of giving Filipinos a majority in the important offices. The job holders don't like it. They can't bear to see the Governor General mixing up with the natives, who may tell him things about the secret government by concessionaires. Mr. Harrison has an idea, evidently, that government of the Philippines must be for the Filipinos and not exclusively for Yankee job holders and promoters. How extraordinary! No wonder Mr. Harrison has the disloyalty of the old-timers—better say "the old gang." They don't like this demonstration of the meaning of the New Freedom, which is also the old freedom.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out of line 5, page 13, the word "elective," and in line 14 the last sentence, as follows:

Senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 13, by striking out in line 5 the word "elective," and in line 14, after the word "occurred," strike out the words "senators and representatives appointed by the Governor General shall hold office until removed by the Governor General."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the term of the appointive senators and representatives who are to represent the non-Christian territory coterminous with the elective senators and representatives, and also to take away from the power of the Governor General a club that he might hold over his appointees to remove them at any time that he saw fit in case they would not reflect his opinion in their votes in either the senate or house of representatives.

I think it is abhorrent to our sense of representative government that even these appointees of the Governor General, the

two senators and nine representatives, who will represent the non-Christian territory, should hold office at the mere beck and call of the Governor General to do his bidding in this assembly. We have adopted the policy in the previous section of having these representatives who look after the interests of these non-Christian territories appointed by the Governor General; but when once they are appointed they should be privileged to serve throughout the extent of their terms and should not be subject to removal without cause by the Governor General. I see the distinguished gentleman, the Commissioner from the Philippines, nodding his head as if in affirmation and as giving assent to this proposition. I hope he does reflect the ideas I am speaking for, because I can not imagine that these men should be subject to removal by the Governor General without any cause whatsoever.

If we take away this power, the Governor General, I assume, will in the first instance exercise rare judgment in the selection of the persons who are to represent these non-Christian people, and if perchance they should act at variance with his opinion it is not saying they should not continue in that representative capacity. They are not appointed to these legislative bodies as his personal representatives; they are appointed there to carry out what they believe to be for the best interests of the non-Christian people. If you are going to leave them subject to removal by the Governor General, instead of appointing two senators and nine representatives you might just as well—if you do not wish to give opportunity for the appointment of mere playthings in politics, mere automatons, to indicate the will of the Governor General—have one in the senate and one in the house who will always be regarded as the spokesman and rubber stamp of the Governor General.

I think this amendment should be adopted and accepted by the committee in carrying out that idea by giving the greatest representative government that is compatible with existing conditions in the islands to the Filipinos. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to oppose this amendment. The gentleman, of course, is aware of the fact that the Governor General himself has no fixed term. The President of the United States can remove him at any time, and the same is true of the members of the Philippine Commission. The President to-day can remove all nine of them. It is also—

Mr. STAFFORD. Subject, however, to confirmation by the Senate.

Mr. JONES. Subject to confirmation by the Senate, of course. That is, the appointment of their successors is subject to approval by the Senate, but the Senate has nothing to do with the removal of the Governor General and the other members. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that shortly before the end of the last administration one of the Philippine Commission, a distinguished citizen, a Republican, and a man who had been a member of the supreme court of one of our States, was removed summarily by the President of the United States because he did not agree with another member of the commission. He had been to the United States on a vacation. He had started back to the Philippine Islands and had gotten as far as Europe on his way when he was cabled to return to the United States. It seems that in the meantime Mr. Forbes had been here, had had a talk with the President, the result of which was his dismissal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was in an administrative capacity, and—

Mr. JONES. I understand.

Mr. STAFFORD. And of course there had to be harmony of action where they were administering the affairs of the Philippines. This is a legislative capacity entirely.

Mr. JONES. Yes; and if the Governor General of the Philippines were to remove one of these representatives because he did not carry out his will, the President of the United States, if he did what was right, would immediately cut off the official head of the Governor General. That would be the action of the President.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose, then, that these representatives in the respective chambers are to be the reflex action or the representatives of the Governor General rather than representatives of these non-Christian people?

Mr. JONES. No. It is believed they will be the representatives of the non-Christian people, but, as I have said over and over during the course of this debate, the committee knows of no better way of selecting them than leaving it to the Governor General. These uncivilized people are not capable of selecting their own representatives, and the gentleman himself, I think,



would not, if he would reflect for a moment, like to see a man put in the senate or house of representatives who, turning out to be utterly unfit for the trust reposed in him, the Governor General could not remove.

The Philippine Assembly once expelled one of its members for improper conduct, and it is possible that for some good and sufficient reason the Governor General may have to exercise the power here given him. I hope not.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not leave that authority to them?

Mr. JONES. The legislature can not do it.

Mr. STAFFORD. We can give them that power here.

Mr. JONES. It is easy to ask why we do not do this or that in the bill. The bill has been prepared with the utmost care, and the committee has come to the conclusion that this is the best way to solve this very difficult problem. And, as I said a few moments ago, it meets the approval of nearly everybody who has considered it. It meets the absolute approval of former Vice Gov. Gen. Gilbert, who was here a short time ago?

Mr. STAFFORD. Who is he?

Mr. JONES. He was the Vice Governor General of the Philippine Islands under the Taft administration, and he served in this House, I think, with the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now recall the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. JONES. He is a very distinguished member of the gentleman's own party.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had said he was formerly a Representative from the State of Indiana, I would have immediately recalled him. I remember him very well.

Mr. JONES. Well, that distinguished gentleman, who was once a member of the commission, who as Vice Governor General acted as Governor General in the absence of Gov. Forbes, was shown this provision of the bill, and he thoroughly approves it. He has been in the Philippine Islands a great many years and consequently has much knowledge as to conditions there.

Mr. CLINE. Let me say right there that I would hate to have any reflection cast against Mr. Gilbert. He is my dooryard neighbor and has been for a number of years.

Mr. STAFFORD. There was no intention of doing that.

Mr. CLINE. And I can vouch for his stand-pat Republicanism. It is as pure and undefiled as that of any Representative you have in this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose that is one reason why he is so much appreciated by the gentleman.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] defeated him for reelection to this House, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. CLINE. He preceded me as a Member of this House.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recall his distinguished service as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, there is one other thought I wanted to suggest to the House, in addition to the suggestion made by the chairman of the committee [Mr. JONES], as to why this amendment should not be adopted. The proposition of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], if adopted, would provide that the appointive senator should have a term of six years under the Towner amendment, and there would be no control over him from any source. Now, the gentleman understands that there is a somewhat delicate situation existing between the non-Christian tribes and the government of the Philippine Islands. It is entirely within the range of possibility that the Governor General might make a selection of a senator or a representative for the non-Christian territory which would be good at the time it was made, and which would be satisfactory to the non-Christian people at the time it was made, but which, because of shifting conditions, might become unsatisfactory to that same people; and if there did not exist a power of removing such a man it might lead to very delicate and embarrassing results in the Philippine Islands. I am sure gentlemen can appreciate that fact when they think carefully of what the situation is in the Philippines.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That the senate and house of representatives, respectively, shall be the sole judges of the elections, returns, and qualifications of their elective members, and each house may determine the rules of its proceedings. Both houses shall convene at the capital on the 16th day of October following the next election and organize by the election of a speaker or a presiding officer, a clerk, and a sergeant at arms for each house, and such other officers and assistants as may be required. The legislature shall hold annual sessions, commencing on the 16th day of October, or, if the 16th day of October be a legal holiday, then on the first day following which is not a legal holiday, in each year and continuing not exceeding 90 days thereafter (Sundays and holidays not

included). The legislature may be called in special session at any time by the Governor General for general legislation, or for action on such specific subjects as he may designate. No special session shall continue longer than 30 days, exclusive of Sundays. The legislature is hereby given the power and authority to change the date of the commencement of its annual sessions.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute a comma for the period following the word "proceedings," in line 20, section 18, page 13, and insert "punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member."

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment for the reason that I was unable to see why the legislature in the Philippines, both the house and the senate, should not have those powers that we give our own House and Senate under our own form of government. The right to determine the qualification of the members of that body ought to carry with it the right to depose the members. Mr. Chairman, if in the judgment of the assembly or of the senate the parties elected to represent certain districts were unworthy to sit as members of that body.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CLINE. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. Would you think the legislature would not have that power unless it was specifically stated here?

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] that the legislature has that power now, I think. At any rate, it exercises it, and it has expelled one of the most popular Filipinos in the Philippines.

Mr. CLINE. It not only did that, I will say to the Chairman, but they expelled one of the members for conduct that was not becoming a member of the Philippine Assembly, and put another one on trial for the use of money in securing his election, and administered some form of punishment, the precise nature of which I do not distinctly recall now. At any rate, Mr. Chairman, we are writing an organic law for a new system of government in the Philippines.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that I have no objection to the amendment. I do not think it is necessary, but I have no objection to it.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You would have that amendment apply to the appointive members?

Mr. JONES. To the elective members.

Mr. GORDON. It does not say that.

Mr. CLINE. I make that apply here to the members of both houses.

Mr. JONES. To the elective members?

Mr. CLINE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. It only applies to elective members?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; that was my purpose.

Mr. GORDON. I did not understand it that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 13, line 21, after the words "on the," strike out "sixteenth" and "twelfth."

Mr. MOORE. Strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Those words are printed there—"strike out" and "insert" are printed on the blank.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Also on page 14, line 1, after the words "on the," strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth." Also at the end of the line strike out "sixteenth" and insert "twelfth."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, a little while ago the Resident Commissioner from the Philippine Islands [Mr. QUEZON] read a cablegram in which was incorporated a speech by Gov. Gen. Harrison. He suggested at the close of his remarks—I refer to the Philippine Commissioner—that he hoped some day the 12th of October would be celebrated in the Philippines as a national holiday.

Now, here is a bill to establish a new form of government for the Philippines which proposes to open the legislature on the 16th of October. It seems to me, in view of the gentleman's remarks and the appropriateness of the day, that it might be a happy suggestion if the committee would accept this amendment and have this opening legislative day fixed as of the 12th of October instead of the 16th. If the committee will consent



to move the event forward four days, then they will have the national holiday as the gentleman suggested.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if the time ever comes when that day is fixed as a national holiday, I think it would be entirely inappropriate to have it on the meeting day of the legislature. I think one event would interfere very much with the other.

Mr. STAFFORD. They should be allowed to recover from the effects of the holiday?

Mr. JONES. Yes. As the gentleman says, they would probably want to recover from the effects of the celebration before the legislature met.

But, seriously, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MOORE. The gentleman from Virginia will remember that he is speaking in my time.

Mr. JONES. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MOORE. I want to observe to the gentleman from Virginia that the 12th of October is, in many States of the Union, celebrated as a holiday now. It is an anniversary in American history. It is the day on which America was discovered by Christopher Columbus, and it would give an additional interest to the day in the Philippine Islands to have Congress open there then.

Mr. MILLER. I will say to the gentleman that Columbus was looking for the Philippine Islands when he stumbled on America on the 12th of October, 1492. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE. Exactly. I do not know what day it was that the gentleman from Minnesota struck the Philippine Islands, but if you are going to establish these days as holidays it might be very appropriate to fix a "Miller Day" in the islands. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman will yield, the only inappropriate feature about this suggestion is that Gov. Gen. Harrison did not land on the 12th of October, but on the 6th.

Mr. MOORE. Gov. Gen. Harrison was a distinguished Member of this House, whom we all respected very highly, and it would seem to me to be a graceful thing on the part of the Philippine Commission to give him a holiday. Gov. Harrison appealed to both sides of this House in his personal relations, and if the committee should deem it wise to move the opening of the legislature forward four days in his honor, we would have a Philippine national holiday and the opening of the legislature combined on the same day.

Mr. JONES. I do not suppose the gentleman is serious in his suggestion.

Mr. MOORE. I am serious. I think it is a very happy thought.

Mr. JONES. I do not think the gentleman can be serious. Even if the gentleman and the rest of us felt certain that the Filipinos were going to make that day a national holiday, I should not think it would be proper for the legislature to convene on that day. Mr. Chairman, this date was selected because it is the day upon which the legislature now meets. It was not the day upon which the legislature originally met, but it was subsequently, and after careful consideration, fixed upon.

Mr. MILLER. That was before the arrival of Gov. Gen. Harrison, was it not?

Mr. JONES. That was prior to his arrival; yes.

Mr. MILLER. They did not then have it in mind to celebrate the advent of Gov. Gen. Harrison.

Mr. JONES. The legislature has the right to change the date under this bill if it wishes to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have a preferential amendment to perfect the text before an amendment is offered as a new paragraph. Will the gentleman kindly withhold his amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 3, 4, and 5, on page 14, the words "and continuing not exceeding 90 days thereafter, Sundays and holidays not included."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 14, by striking out all after the word "year," in line 3, down to the end of the sentence.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the clause that I move to strike out limits the term of the general session of the legislature to 90 days. Immediately following is a provision limiting to 30 days the special session to be convened at the call of the Governor General. Those special sessions have to be limited to such legislation, either general or special subjects, as he may designate in his proclamation. I think it is highly important to the welfare of the Filipinos, if we are going to give them a large measure of control as this bill purports to give them, to have unlimited time in which to pass on legislation when convened generally once each year. I do not think this Congress should hamstring them in any way, so as to force them to consider legislation within any limited period. I am aware that the constitutions of some States limit the duration of the term of the legislature, but from my knowledge of those conditions I do not believe that limitation is conducive to good legislation. Certainly it is not desirable for a people who are just launching out in legislative practice. If at the end of the 90-day period they are not able to conclude their work, they are then at the mercy of the Governor General, either to have the matters pending included in a special call or to have the legislation go over to the next regular convening of the legislature. If they have reached that stage of political development where they can be trusted with legislative powers, and we are willing to delegate that authority to them, then let us not limit them so that they can not pass intelligently upon the general legislation that this bill intends to vest in the legislature.

We know that the longer the time given to the consideration of legislative measures the better is the consideration. Here we create a new legislature, consisting of an elective house and an elective senate, meeting and organizing. It will take considerable time for those bodies to organize. It will take some time for them to have their committees appointed. It will take considerable time for the committees to give consideration to legislation. Even with the ordinary appropriation bills it takes a couple of months for our committees to report the bills back to the House; yet in this bill you intend to limit these persons, who are unskilled in the art of legislation. The end of the 90-day period will come all too soon. They will be driven to pass bills on the spur of the moment, and it will not be possible to give proper consideration to legislative matters. If the committee think there should be some limitation, so that these Filipinos shall not continue in session all the time, if perchance they have a penchant for sitting in a legislative assembly and legislating, then lengthen the limited period; but I seriously contend that 90 days is altogether too short a period for these novitiates in the art of legislation. Personally I believe there should be no limitation. If they are capable of legislating in self-government, they alone should determine when the term of their legislature should end, and you should not leave them, in case of a limited term, at the mercy of the Governor General to determine what character of legislation may be considered at a special session. They have not the powers of Congress in that respect. When the President calls us in extraordinary session, he may call us for a special purpose, but he can not limit us to that particular class of legislation. Our powers in that respect are unlimited and supreme, and the Philippine Legislature should have the supreme right and ample time to pass upon the legislation that we delegate to them in this organic act.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, this provision of the bill is similar to the provisions upon the same subject in most of the States of the Union. We have a similar provision in the constitution of my State. However, I do not feel inclined to oppose this amendment. I am willing to leave almost everything to the Filipinos themselves, and I shall not oppose the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I now ask to have the amendment reported that I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"The senators and representatives shall receive a compensation for their services to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the treasury of the Philippine Islands. The senators and representatives shall in all cases except treason, felony, and breach of the peace be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the sessions of their respective houses and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit me, I think there is not going to be any objection to the amendment offered, but I suggest whether or not it would not be well to provide that the compensation which the legislature has the power to fix shall be an annual compensation and not leave it so that the legislature could fix a per diem compensa-



tion. If the time is to be unlimited, I am rather inclined to think, in view of the amendment just adopted, that it would be good policy to require that it should be an annual instead of a per diem compensation.

Mr. CLINE. I think it is wise, in view of the amendment just adopted, and I ask leave, Mr. Chairman, to modify my amendment so as to make the compensation an annual one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he ask that this section be passed over for the present and then return to it for the gentleman to perfect his amendment.

Mr. CLINE. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to pass over this section and then return to it in order that the gentleman from Indiana may offer his amendment hereafter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the section be passed over and that the gentleman from Indiana be permitted to return to it later to offer his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question on this section. I would like to know whether the gentleman from Virginia would agree to limit the legislation in the special session to the call of the Governor General; whether he would be willing to strike out the last word on line 6, page 14, and all of line 17, and insert "to consider only such matters as he may designate"? In other words, whether you would be willing to limit the special session to such matters as the Governor General might designate?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the committee gave very careful consideration to this language before adopting it. There might be something very important to come up after the legislature had convened. If it could not consider it then, if it was of sufficient importance, another extra session would have to be called. After careful consideration we adopted the language in the bill.

Mr. FESS. I might say that in our constitutional convention two years ago we limited the legislation to the call of the governor of the special session, and we had a great deal of discussion on it. But the gentleman says that that question was considered fully.

Mr. JONES. Yes; we considered it very fully.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SLAYDEN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had excused Mr. SMITH of Arizona as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and had appointed Mr. THOMPSON in his stead.

#### THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 19. That every bill and joint resolution which shall have passed both houses of the legislature shall, before it becomes a law, be presented to the Governor General. If he approve the same, he shall sign it; but if not, he shall return it with his objections to that house in which it shall have originated, which shall enter the objections at large on its journal and proceed to reconsider it. If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of the members elected to that house shall agree to pass the same, it shall be sent, together with the objections, to the other house, by which it shall likewise be reconsidered, and if approved by two-thirds of all the members elected to that house it shall be sent to the Governor General, who shall transmit the same to the President of the United States. The vote of each house shall be by the yeas and nays, and the names of the members voting for and against shall be entered on the journal. If the President of the United States approve the same, he shall sign it and it shall become a law. If he shall not approve same, he shall return it to the Governor General so stating, and it shall not become a law: *Provided*, That if any bill or joint resolution shall not be returned by the Governor General as herein provided within 10 days (Sundays excepted) after it shall have been presented to him the same shall become a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the legislature by adjournment prevent its return, in which case it shall not be a law. The Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, but the veto shall not affect the item or items to which he does not object. The item or items objected to shall not take effect except in the manner heretofore provided in this section as to bills and joint resolutions returned to the legislature without his approval.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, line 8, page 15, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "thirty."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, page 15, line 8, by striking out the word "ten" and inserting the word "thirty."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the provision is that unless the Governor General shall veto a bill within 10 days it will

become a law without his approval. I think the time is manifestly too short, and for this reason, which perhaps did not occur to the gentleman on the other side: I can conceive of a case where the Governor General seriously considers whether or not a veto shall be placed on a bill passed by the legislature, that it might, and almost certainly would, become his duty to communicate with the authorities at Washington regarding the matter before he takes such a responsibility. I think the time would be too short for this to be done, and, as I see it, no harm could come by extending it to 30 days.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. QUEZON. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to introduce further on an amendment providing that the absolute veto power be left in the Governor General's hands and not in the hands of the President of the United States?

Mr. TOWNER. I have such an amendment under consideration, but that need not affect consideration of the one I now offer.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I was not sure when the limit of 10 days was put in the bill that it would not be better to have it 15 days, but I have never thought that it would be right to have it as long as 30 days. If the gentleman would modify it to 20 days, I should be inclined to accept it.

Mr. TOWNER. I do not think 15 days is enough, but I will accept what I can get.

Mr. JONES. I would prefer 15, but rather than take up the time I will agree to 20.

Mr. TOWNER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask to modify my amendment by making it read "20" instead of "30."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks to modify his amendment by making it 20 days instead of 30. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 14, after the word "bill," insert the following: "or any independent provision not germane to the bill."

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, the reason I offer this amendment is this: The provision in the bill is that the Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items of an appropriation bill, and then, so far as the extension of power is granted, it stops. I desire to add this further power to the Governor General which I think is accepted by most jurists now as a most important power, one that is being placed in new constitutions that are being adopted, that any independent provision which may be placed in a bill which is not germane to it, the thing that we call a "rider," should be subject to the veto of the Governor General. We all know how that works in Congress. We all know how many iniquities are perpetrated in Congress by such practice, and it is to avoid this that I offer the amendment. While it is given to the Governor General to veto an independent item of an appropriation bill, yet the legislature has the power to put any iniquitous, not germane, absolutely independent provision upon any appropriation bill and force the Governor General to sign the whole bill or allow the appropriation during the latter days of the session to fail.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman to another provision in the bill which I think he has overlooked, and that is that a bill must deal only with one subject matter, and that must be expressed in the title.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, that provision exists, as the gentleman well knows, in very many of the State constitutions, and in the passage by the legislature of these acts it is more honored in the breach than in the observance. Here is the difficulty with regard to that: For instance, an appropriation bill of that kind is passed, which would be subject to objection, which, if passed upon in the courts, might perhaps be held to be unconstitutional, and yet the importance of the passage of the law is so great that no one would dare raise the question and will suffer the iniquity to prevail rather than allow the bill to fail. Why should we not avoid these things, if we can, by the insertion of the provision which I suggest?

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Does not the gentleman's amendment limit itself to appropriation bills?

Mr. TOWNER. I hardly think so.



Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand the question of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I raise the question whether the amendment of the gentleman does not limit itself to appropriation bills, when I think he wants it to apply to all bills as well as appropriation bills?

Mr. JONES. I did not think the gentleman wanted it to apply to any but appropriation bills.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. HELM. The thought occurred to me that such an amendment as that would be very fertile of litigation, and also that if the court is going to sit in judgment and say what is and what is not germane, it seems like investing the court with legislative power or power in legislative proceedings.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. Why would not this cover it:

The Governor General shall have the power to veto any particular item or items or provision in an appropriation bill.

I do not think that power ought to be given except upon an appropriation bill, because it is on an appropriation bill that that sort of thing is done. I would leave out the word "germane" entirely.

Mr. TOWNER. The language of the amendment is:

And any independent provision not germane to the bill.

Mr. COOPER. I would eliminate the feature of germaneness and make it any independent provision. There can not be any coercion practiced that is iniquitous except in an appropriation bill, and the legislature has the power not to appropriate for the supplies of the government unless certain things are agreed to.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question if the gentleman from Iowa will permit.

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. If you limit it to an appropriation bill, the veto power of this bill extends to anything not germane without further amendment, because you can veto any item in the bill without affecting the other part of the bill. If the item is not germane, he will veto it as it stands, but the gentleman from Iowa wants it to apply to all legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. I understood the technical point the gentleman from Iowa had in mind was that the language "item or items" would mean appropriations.

Mr. TOWNER. I think that is true.

Mr. COOPER. In an appropriation bill those are items of appropriation, and if you say "item or items in an appropriation bill or any other provision therein contained" that would cover it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say further, with regard to the matter, and especially with regard to what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Cooper] said, that I think the language that is used in this amendment is better than that suggested by him for the reason that if it is an independent provision which is not germane to the bill, it is as clearly designated as it would be possible to designate it by language. Such language has a well-determined meaning. We have had decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States of what is germane and what is not germane. It is not a difficult proposition. Speakers and others acting as such in the House have been passing upon that for years, and it is a question that is peculiarly within the court's province.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not the desire of the gentleman from Iowa to give the Governor General of the Philippines the right to veto any provision in an appropriation bill?

Mr. TOWNER. It is.

Mr. COOPER. Whether it is germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. Well, under the provisions of the bill now—

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that the gentleman wants the Governor General to have the power to veto any provision in an appropriation bill, whether it be germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman speaks about a "provision" —

Mr. COOPER. Well, any item.

Mr. TOWNER (continuing). While the language of the bill is "item." As the language of the bill now is, it says "shall have the power to veto any item or items of an appropriation bill," and that means particular appropriations for any particular purpose.

Mr. COOPER. If the gentleman said any item or provision in an appropriation bill that would cover it, but the gentleman wants him to have the power of veto whether it is germane or not?

Mr. TOWNER. I am inclined to think possibly it might have that interpretation. I do not question that. I am only saying this to make clear what is the purpose and intent of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my good friend from Iowa [Mr. Towner], as highly as I respect his legal ability, that this is a desirable amendment. I think it really gives to the Governor General an arbitrary power that he ought not to have. The provision as to vetoing items in an appropriation bill is not an unknown provision in constitutions in different States in our country, and I think it is a wise provision, because it prevents the enforcement of an objectionable appropriation or item of law into a bill in order to secure the subsistence on which to run the government where there is a conflict between the governor and the legislature. But when you go beyond that, when you get away from appropriation bills and get to laws of other kinds, it seems to me that you have gone far enough when you provide by your constitution that which is in the constitution of many of the States of the Union, to the effect that the bill must only contain a single subject, and that subject must be clearly expressed in the title. That is a provision which is in the constitution of my own State, and it has led to considerable litigation, it is true, but it is better that we should go to the courts, in my opinion, than to leave it to the power of any Governor General arbitrarily to determine on the idea of germaneness. There would be absolutely no appeal from his decision. If he says, "I veto this provision in this bill because it is not germane," there is no appeal from his decision to any other tribunal except back to the legislature, where it will have to be passed by a two-thirds vote over his veto. I know of no such provision in any constitution of any State in this country. I am not familiar with the decisions of the United States Supreme Court to which the gentleman referred, discussing the question of germaneness, but the courts would never get any chance to pass on that proposition under this provision. It is left to the arbitrary power of the Governor General to exercise upon any idea that he might have on the question of germaneness. I do not think it is desirable or wise; on the contrary, I think it is dangerous.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I think, and have long thought, that the President of the United States ought to be given the power to veto any item in an appropriation bill that does not meet with his approval. In vetoing a measure he acts as a legislator. The exercise of the veto power is a legislative act. The President of the United States combines two functions—one, that of an executive, and the other that of a legislator. The act of vetoing a bill is the expression of his disapproval as a lawmaker. As a lawmaker he ought to have the right to be heard upon each item of an appropriation bill, and especially ought he to have the right to veto riders on appropriation bills. The Governor General in the Philippines ought to have a similar right. A rider may embody a proposition which the Philippine Assembly might desire to have become a law, but a proposition to which the Governor General and the Philippine Senate might be hostile. In such a case it would be possible for one house to say to the other house and to the executive, "We will refuse to help appropriate money to meet the necessary expenses of the government unless you will vote for this rider. You must take this rider, to which you are opposed, or we will starve the government." Legislation ought not to be the result of such coercion. It should be the free, untrammelled act of the legislature and the executive. The executive should have the right to say, "I am opposed to this provision in this appropriation bill. In my judgment it is a dangerous provision. Moreover, it is a provision that ought not to be in an appropriation bill at all. It is not an appropriation; it has no relation to any appropriation. I shall veto this particular item. If you wish it to become a law, you must again consider it and pass it by a two-thirds vote over my objection."

I have seen some very wrong things done in Congress through riders on appropriation bills and have more than once protested against them. We ought not to leave it possible for one house of the Philippine Legislature to say, "We will not pass the appropriations necessary to continue the Philippine Government



unless you will take such or such a law for Mindanao or Mindoro or Cebu." The payment of the legitimate expenses of the Philippine Government ought to be a subject separate and apart and to be considered by itself.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. It will not be at all wise to permit the Philippine Legislature to put riders on appropriation bills.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I quite agree with the gentleman as to appropriation bills.

Mr. COOPER. And I would not put them on anything else.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. And we have that provision in the bill. Of course, the gentleman is aware of that fact. But I want to ask him if he does not think it is probably dangerous to go beyond appropriation bills and take ordinary matters of legislation and vest in the Governor General the absolute power of determining whether a thing is germane or not and vetoing it on that ground?

Mr. COOPER. My idea is to confine it to appropriation bills at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 12, after the word "shall," strike out "not be a law" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "be made a matter of record in the office of secretary of state, who at the opening of the next session of the legislature shall report the same as the unfinished business after the organization of the legislature."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the Clerk report the amendment again? I did not quite catch it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the chairman of the committee say whether he would object to a proposition that when a bill is introduced and passed by the legislature and held by the Governor General without signing it, and before the 10 days are up the legislature adjourns, and thus the law fails, which would be called a "pocket veto," whether he would object to saving that feature by making this the unfinished legislation at the opening of the next session? It can be made a matter of record so as to become the unfinished business at the opening of the next legislature. That is the idea we have in Ohio. Legislation fails by the pocket veto when the legislature adjourns short of 10 days. On the other hand, if the legislature was in session the proposition would become a law if the governor would hold it. We prevent that veto by making that the unfinished business to be taken up by the next legislature. In Ohio it is retained in the secretary of state's office until the next session of the legislature and by him passed over to that body. That is to prevent a governor pocketing a piece of legislation and killing it by virtue of the legislature adjourning within the 10 days.

Mr. HELM. What is the procedure at the reconvening of the next legislature?

Mr. FESS. First, they organize the legislature, and this is laid before them as unfinished business.

Mr. HELM. De novo?

Mr. FESS. It comes up as a matter of record. It is taken up as the unfinished business and acted upon for or against.

Mr. HELM. And you pass it again?

Mr. FESS. Yes; reenact it. It saves the loss of it by the governor just pocketing it.

Mr. HELM. Is it subject to amendment?

Mr. FESS. Certainly. It could come up originally as new matter, but in this way it does not have to be reintroduced. It is made a part of the record in the office of the secretary of state. The wording of the Ohio constitution is, if a bill shall not be returned by the governor within 10 days, Sundays excepted, it shall become a law in like manner as if he had signed it, unless the general assembly by adjournment prevents its return, in which case it shall become a law, unless within 10 days after such adjournment it shall be filed by him with his objections in writing in the office of secretary of state.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman addressed a question to me, as to whether or not I would be willing to accept the amendment he proposes. He says there is a similar provision in the constitution of the State of Ohio; but, if so, I know of no other State that has such a provision. The gentleman is aware of the fact, I suppose, that there is no such position in the Philippines as secretary of state?

Mr. FESS. I should have said the office corresponding to that of secretary of state. That would be the secretary of the interior, would it not?

Mr. JONES. I can not say.

Mr. FESS. I would modify that to suit the situation.

Mr. JONES. I do not know what the position would be, but I do not think that the amendment ought to be adopted. It is an experiment, to say the least of it. As I have already said, I do not know of any State except the State of Ohio which has such a provision.

Mr. FESS. It makes the pocket veto impossible.

Mr. JONES. Any bill failing to become law because of the so-called pocket veto could be reintroduced at the next session. I see no reason why such a bill should be made the continuing order.

Mr. FESS. It should be the executive secretary, I suppose, instead of the secretary of state.

Mr. JONES. So I would not be willing, Mr. Chairman, to accept the amendment.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion in the latter part of the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia covered what I wanted to say, which was, in substance, this: That there is nothing to prevent the reintroduction of such a measure at the next session of the congress, or whatever it may be called, and its enactment. The only advantage I would see is that in effect it would become a special order and thereby hasten by a trifle its consideration.

Mr. FESS. The advantage is this, namely, that the governor would not likely put it in his pocket if he knew it was a continuing order and could be taken up at the next session. That is the main advantage. He would act upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, line 12, after the word "law," insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the President of the United States shall approve or disapprove an act submitted to him under the provisions of this section within six months from and after its passage and submission for his approval, and if not approved within such time it shall become a law, the same as if it had been specifically approved."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the committee indicate whether he is willing to accept this amendment or not?

Mr. JONES. I do not know of any special objection to it. I did not catch all of the language.

Mr. MILLER. It is the same as we adopted to the preceding paragraph, except that I notice the word "passage" is used there instead of "enactment."

Mr. JONES. I would be glad if the Clerk would report the amendment again and read it slowly, so that we can catch it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. JONES. It reads "if not disapproved within such time?"

Mr. MILLER. It is the same as the language of the preceding amendment that we adopted.

Mr. JONES. I have no objection to it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to change the word "passage" in the amendment to the word "enactment," so that the language would be the same at this point as at other points in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to modify the language of his amendment as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUEZON. Mr. Chairman, in justice to myself I wish to make a short statement to the committee. I am not at all satisfied with the provision of this bill regarding the appointment and the tenure of office of senators and representatives for the non-Christians. I have not, however, taken any part in the debate upon this subject, because, knowing, as I think I do, the reasons why the majority of the Committee on Insular Affairs thought it necessary to write those provisions, I was inclined to believe that it is more expedient to let them stand as they are.

It is evident, from the little I know of the sentiments of the membership of this House, that the idea of having the so-called senators and representatives appointed by the executive is as much abhorrent to them as it is to me, and so it is to make the tenure of office of those senators and representatives dependent upon the will of the executive. But, as I understand it, there was this practical question to meet by those responsible for the framing of the bill: They were aware that one of the most



debated features of the Philippine problem in this country is that of the administration and government of the non-Christian inhabitants of the archipelago. So much has been said about the unfriendly relations between the Christians and non-Christians in the islands, incompetency of the former to deal with the latter, and other absurdities of this kind, that, unless some kind of peculiar provision was decided upon whereby a partial concession to that contention is made, this bill would have been assailed as unwise legislation, and perhaps it would have been insisted that the non-Christians should be left entirely out of the control of the Philippine Legislature. Why, Mr. Chairman, there has just been introduced an amendment to this bill creating a special commission, to be appointed by the President of the United States, vested with the exclusive power to legislate for the non-Christians.

There is another reason why I have not opposed this proposition upon this floor. As I understand it, this is only a temporary arrangement which the Philippine Legislature, with the approval of the Governor General, may, by enactment, change.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. QUEZON. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Is it the gentleman's position that he does not approve the provisions of this bill intended to meet the situation? Does the gentleman believe that the provisions in this bill as they stand are not such as best to meet the situation with respect to the non-Christian tribes?

Mr. QUEZON. The gentleman is correct. I do not really approve of these provisions; but, as I said, I take them for reasons of expediency and because the Philippine Legislature herein provided and organized, with the approval of the Governor General, is empowered to amend that part of the law. I ask the gentleman from Virginia if I am not right?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. QUEZON. So that the legislature can meet this question?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. I just wanted to get the gentleman on record clearly; that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. MILLER. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 19, yeas 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, have we finished that section?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same. If at the termination of any fiscal year the appropriations necessary for the support of government for the ensuing fiscal year shall not have been made, the several sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for the objects and purposes therein specified, so far as the same may be done, shall be deemed to be reappropriated for the several objects and purposes specified in said last appropriation bill; and until the legislature shall act in such behalf the treasurer shall, when so directed by the Governor General, make the payments necessary for the purposes aforesaid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first sentence of the paragraph, which reads as follows:

All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 15, lines 19, 20, and 21, strike out the following language: "All laws enacted by the Philippine Legislature shall be reported to the Congress of the United States, which hereby reserves the power and authority to annul the same."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, my main objection is to the reserve power of Congress at any time it sees fit, no matter how distant in the future after the enactment by the legislature, to annul some well-considered legislation that may even have been approved by the President of the United States.

In this bill we safeguard the interests of the Filipinos and the interests of the United States by reserving to the President the authority to veto all legislation relating to the tariff and revenue policy of the Philippine Islands, and also to their currency, and we further place a permissive veto power in the President's hands on all legislation that may be enacted by the legislature in reference to the forests, lands, and mining.

I assume that the committee, in singling out those subjects for special exception, considered that they were principal matters that should not become enacted into law without first being considered by the Philippine Legislature, by the Governor General, and then by the President of the United States.

To go to the further extreme and allow Congress at any time, without any limitation of time, to veto and annul all legislation, after perchance contract rights have become established, is, I think, going contrary to the spirit of this bill in seeking to vest in the Filipinos the right of self-government. I can not see wherein Congress should have that power, if we are safeguarding the interests of the Filipinos and also the interests of this Government wherein they are concerned, namely, in their tariff and currency system, or should go further than that. And, furthermore, I do not think that Congress is going to be concerned in passing upon that legislation after it passes the scrutiny of the President in the cases enumerated.

If it is the theory that the Congress should overlord the Government of the Philippines, well and good. We first appoint a Governor General whom we assume is capable. He is appointed by the President for the purpose of safeguarding the interests of the Filipinos; and then, in addition to that, we reserve to the President the absolute right to say that no tariff legislation and no currency legislation shall become law until approved by the President; and then, further, we reserve the qualifying veto that, if the legislation refers to forests, lands, or mines, the President may, within six months after its presentation to him, veto the same.

Mr. QUEZON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am very glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. QUEZON. Of course, I sympathize with every proposition that tends to give more power to the Philippine Legislature; but I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that after striking out of the bill that section the Congress will still have the power and the authority to annul the laws of the Philippine Legislature? In my opinion, Congress would still have that power.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, Congress is sovereign, but we are establishing in the organic act what shall be the policy of this Government. This provision is absolutely inconsistent with the other provisions of this law. We say to the Filipinos, "We are giving you some sort of autonomous government, at least so far as certain legislation is concerned," and then we are putting in here a qualifying clause that would nullify all that legislation at some time in the distant future. It is utterly in conflict with the theory of this bill.

Mr. QUEZON. I hope the gentleman will not misunderstand me. I do not want him to think, nor do I want to be put in the RECORD as not favoring the idea of letting the Philippine Legislature be untrammelled. I just want to be sure whether the gentleman thinks that if that section is stricken out Congress will no longer have the power to annul our laws.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Congress has the right at any time to change this law or to change the whole form of government in the Philippine Islands; but in the organic act itself we should not lay it down as a fundamental principle that we are intending to scrutinize and pass judgment on all the legislation that may be enacted by the Philippine Legislature. If I understand the purpose of this bill, it is that the Philippine Legislature shall be vested with absolute power in certain particulars to work out their own destiny. If they fail in that endeavor, then we will have to provide a substitute government; but the very idea of the gentleman is that they are fit for greater power than this bill confers. Why should we nullify the power we give them by proclaiming the idea that all the legislation that they pass shall be subject to the negating power of Congress? It is not contemplated by any of us that we are going to pass upon their legislative acts.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Wisconsin seems to be very earnest about this.

Mr. STAFFORD. I certainly am.

Mr. JONES. I want to ask the gentleman if he was a Member of Congress 12 years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. Unfortunately I was not.

Mr. JONES. I was going to say that if the gentleman was here he voted for a similar provision at that time as to Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands also.

Mr. STAFFORD. I came into Congress just after its enactment. But the fact that we passed a provision 12 years ago is not to say that to-day we ought to pass the same enactment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.



The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Filipinos have advanced under American guidance, by the aid of the Americans who have been sent there to educate them and instruct them in the art of government, until they have laid the foundations on which the Filipinos can build. When we took up the occupation 12 years ago they were new to government, but I hope that they are sufficiently advanced now—at least that is the contention of the gentleman from Virginia—so that we should give them some freedom, so that they may pass this legislation without having it submitted afterwards to the negative vote of Congress.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has the gentleman time in two minutes to yield for a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does not the gentleman think that Congress will have the power to make their enactments nugatory as long as the present relation between our Government and theirs continues to exist? Will not Congress continue to have that power if it chooses to exercise it?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but we should not lay down here a principle that is inconsistent with the other provisions of this bill. The fundamental principle of this bill is that we are giving to the Filipinos absolute power to pass legislation on certain matters. Then we reserve to the President and the Governor General certain veto powers. No legislation affecting the tariff or the currency shall become effective until it has been approved by the President. Their legislation affecting mines, lands, and forests may be reviewed and may be vetoed by the President, but as to the other legislation this bill says their action shall be absolute. Now, why put in this qualifying clause and say that Congress shall have the authority to negative all that legislation when we do not intend to exercise that power?

Mr. SLAYDEN. It is a mere statement of fact. We have that power.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from Wisconsin, in response to questions addressed to him by the Resident Commissioner [Mr. QUEZON] and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], has admitted that, whether the language objected to by him is left in this bill or not, Congress will still have the right to annul any legislation passed by the Philippine Legislature. If that be so, it seems to me that the difference is just that between tweedledum and tweedledee. I can not understand how the gentleman can speak so earnestly upon a subject that he admits is of no practical moment. His position is that Congress undoubtedly has the power that is given in the bill, but that for some reason it should not declare that it possesses it.

Mr. STAFFORD. I take it that it should not be the declared policy of Congress when you are claiming that the Filipinos are after absolute independence.

Mr. JONES. I understand the gentleman to say that Congress can annul any act of the Philippine Legislature, but should not say that it can do so. I do not think there is any force in the gentleman's objection to the use of this language in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. In a moment. I will say to the gentleman that this has been the policy of this Government with reference to the Philippines as well as to Porto Rico ever since those countries have been given civil government. Unfortunately, Congress never takes any notice of any act that is reported to it.

I recall, Mr. Chairman, that I recently asked the House to give its consent to have printed certain acts of the Porto Rican Legislature, which, as is required by law, were certified to Congress. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objected on the ground that Congress never paid any attention to these acts. I must admit that there was much truth in what the gentleman said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 20. That the qualified electors of the Philippine Islands shall, on the first Tuesday in June, 1915, and at the general elections thereafter provided for the election of senators and representatives to the Philippine Legislature, elect two Resident Commissioners to the United States, who shall be entitled to an official recognition as such by all departments upon presentation to the President of a certificate of election by the Governor General of said Islands. Each of said Resident Commissioners shall, in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law, be allowed the same sum for stationery and for the pay of

necessary clerk hire as is now allowed to the Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, to be paid out of the Treasury of the United States, and the franking privilege allowed by law to Members of Congress. No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said Islands owing allegiance to the United States and who is not more than 30 years of age and who does not read and write the English language. The two Resident Commissioners elected in June, 1915, shall hold their office from the first Monday in the month of December following until the 4th of March, 1919, and the term of their successors shall be for four years, beginning from the 4th of March following their election. In case of vacancy in the position of Resident Commissioner caused by resignation or otherwise, the Governor General may make temporary appointments until the next meeting of the Philippine Legislature, which shall then fill such vacancy; but the Resident Commissioner thus elected shall hold office only for the unexpired portion of the term wherein the vacancy occurred.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting patiently all day, having in mind what the gentleman from Massachusetts said was the purpose of the minority, and that was to prevent abuses. I have seen hardly a Member present from New England this afternoon, and in order that we may get some of them in I make the point of order that no quorum is present.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman is in error. There are a great many Members from New England here—the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GREENE], the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS], and a dozen others.

Mr. DONOVAN. Well, Mr. Chairman, rather than get into a controversy over it I will withdraw the point. But there is not a single Member from Illinois and hardly a Member from the Middle States. [Laughter.] There is only one from New York, and only one from the whole Pacific coast.

Mr. TALCOTT of New York. I beg the gentleman's pardon. There are three or four right around him from New York.

Mr. DONOVAN. I was talking about the minority.

Mr. BRYAN. I take exception to the gentleman's remark about the Pacific coast. There are several here.

Mr. PAYNE. There are several Members from New York present on this side.

Mr. STAFFORD. And there are three here from Wisconsin, others from New York and Minnesota.

Mr. MILLER. And the majority is not represented by more than 15 Members.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes; but think of the quality. [Laughter.] The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut withdraws his point of order.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask now to have my amendment to section 18, which was passed over some time ago, again reported as modified.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, what became of the point of order made by the gentleman from Connecticut?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdrew the point of order.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the State of Pennsylvania for having one Member present in order to ask a question, you are so seldom seen here.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, are amendments now in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] has an amendment pending.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment as modified be again reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 18, line 11, page 14, insert a new section, as follows:

"The senators and representatives shall receive an annual compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law and paid out of the treasury of the Philippine Islands. The senators and representatives shall in all cases, except treason, felony, and breach of the peace, be privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and in going to and returning from the same; and for any speech or debate in either house they shall not be questioned in any other place."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if he does not think his amendment should come in as another paragraph?

Mr. CLINE. Yes; Mr. Chairman, I ask to modify the amendment, so as to have it come in as an additional paragraph instead of an additional section.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment, so that it will come in as an additional paragraph. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana wish to discuss it?

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment because I believe it is based upon the soundest public policy. The two branches of the Philippine Legislature constitute a coordinate branch with the other governmental forces of the islands. But



the assembly and the senate, constituting the Philippine Legislature, coordinate with themselves. Consequently, all those rules and regulations in which each is vitally interested should be fixed in the organic act. It has been said that in formulating, as we are here, a law that shall be the basis of legislation in the Philippines, we can not expect to designate other than the important objects to be accomplished and that the minor ingredients that are involved in the important objects are proper subjects for legislation. This is undoubtedly true. When this amendment was proposed to our Constitution the matter was referred to what was known as a detail committee, of which Mr. Madison was a member. His understanding of the province of an organic act was not different than what I have stated. And yet he insisted that the language I propose now to insert into the Philippine act should be inserted in our Constitution. The question as to the extent that legislative bodies should go in writing a constitution has frequently been raised in considering this bill. In connection with that proposition I desire to quote the language of Chief Justice Marshall, used in the McCulloch case, Fourth Wheaton, page 407:

A constitution to contain an accurate detail of all the subdivisions of which its great powers will admit, and of all the means by which they may be carried into execution, would partake of the prolixity of a legal code, and could scarcely be embraced by the human mind. It would probably never be understood by the public. Its nature, therefore, requires that only its great outline should be marked, its important objects designated, and the minor ingredients which compose those objects be deduced from the nature of the objects themselves.

Undoubtedly with that understanding of their duties in mind the framers of the Constitution still wrote the amendment that I present into the Constitution of the United States. Let me call the committee's attention to the fact that there is the strongest reciprocal relation expressed between the members of the Philippine Legislature and the people they represent. It is undoubtedly true that for the proper conduct of public business members of the Philippine Congress should be "privileged from arrest during their attendance at the session of their respective houses, and going to and from the same," and that each legislator should be free and without restraint to express his well-grounded opinion and conviction upon any subject before that body, and he should not be held to an account for his opinion or for his speech in any other place. The people likewise have rights to be protected. It should be embodied in the organic law that for treason, felony, or breach of the peace no legislator should be permitted to shelter himself under the legislative cover of his own enactment. As I said before, these rights are so reciprocal, so based upon sound public policy, that in the United States they have been engrafted in almost identical terms in nearly every State constitution.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 16, after the word "salary," strike out the words "and expenses," and on the same page, line 17, after the words "sum for," insert the words "mileage and."

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am as much inclined to be liberal with the members of congress of the Philippine Islands as any Member on the floor, but I question whether we ought to be more liberal with them than with ourselves. What the term "and expenses," in line 16, means I do not know. I do not know whether it is intended to include mileage or not. It is not so stated.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. It says "expenses now allowed by law." The law allows them \$2,000 for expenses in lieu of regular mileage that we receive.

Mr. MOORE. Does that include mileage?

Mr. SLAYDEN. That is the mileage.

Mr. COOPER. That is the mileage.

Mr. MOORE. They are allowed \$2,000 for mileage?

Mr. COOPER. It is in lieu of mileage, and they also have a secretary.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the section proposes to give to each of the members in addition to the salary and expenses now allowed by law the same sum for stationery and pay of necessary clerk hire as is now paid Members of the House of Representatives of the United States. That does not appear to include mileage.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Instead of allowing the Philippine Commissioners the mileage based upon distance, the Congress has allowed them a limited sum for mileage of \$2,000, and this provision carries that into the law.

Mr. MOORE. Is it the gentleman's understanding that \$2,000 covers their entire pay and also their mileage and expenses?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, no; it covers merely their mileage allowance for traveling from the Philippines here and back.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, this is for the Philippine Commissioners to the United States?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; the two Resident Commissioners who represent the Philippines in the Congress.

Mr. SLAYDEN. In addition to their salary as Commissioners, and in addition to the \$2,000 which is given them in lieu of mileage on the distance basis, they are allowed by this provision clerk hire and stationery.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I offered this amendment under a misapprehension, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee to interpret the phrase "bona fide elector of said islands, owing allegiance to the United States, and who is not more than 30 years of age," which occurs in lines 22, 23, 24, and 25, on page 16. What is the legal evidence of that status—"owing allegiance to the United States"?

Mr. MILLER. In other words, does it refer to the islands or to the Commissioners?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. And if it refers to the Commissioners, just what condition of allegiance?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any difficulty about that. There has been some question heretofore as to the use of the words "bona fide." I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] or some gentleman on that side suggested the word "actual" in lieu of the words bona fide.

Mr. MILLER. That was simply because the word "actual" had previously been used in the bill.

Mr. JONES. I said at that time that I did not understand that there was any difference between the word "actual" and the words "bona fide" as they were used. Of course, owing allegiance to the United States applies to the Resident Commissioners and not to the islands. The language is plain, and I will read it:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands owing allegiance to the United States and who is not more than 30 years of age.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can readily see that any construction of that language suggests that "owing" refers to the islands fully as much as to the Commissioners, and possibly more.

Mr. JONES. If that were true it would make no difference, but it can not be true.

Mr. QUEZON. That is copied from the old law.

Mr. MILLER. Even though the old law made a mistake, we do not want to repeat it here.

Mr. JONES. As has been suggested, this language is an exact copy of the law passed by Congress 12 years ago and for which the gentleman's party is responsible.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. JONES. Therefore, I may refer the gentleman's question to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER], who was chairman of the committee at that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin has just left the Chamber.

Mr. MILLER. "No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner," assuming that the construction of the chairman of the committee is correct, "who is not a bona fide elector of said island and who does not owe allegiance to the United States." Now, that would make it clearer, as far as the language is concerned.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The question the gentleman suggests is a differentiation in his mind between "islands" and "persons."

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Clearly that differentiation is proper. The word "islands," as used in this relation, undoubt-

edly means the physical land which is there. That being the case, you could not have land owing allegiance. The land could not owe allegiance to the United States. It is nothing but the individual who could owe allegiance.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman can offer a very excellent argument on that hypothesis, but the language is "islands owing allegiance to the United States," and I can readily conceive how that phraseology may mean territory from which the man comes is part of territory owing allegiance to the people of the United States.

Mr. JONES. I will say to the gentleman that I have the organic law in my hand. It provides:

That no person shall be eligible at such election who is not a qualified elector of said islands owing allegiance to the United States, and who is not 30 years of age.

That has been the law for the past 12 years, and there has never been any confusion or question about it, and it seems to me—

Mr. MILLER. It is not that which bothers me. I am willing to accede to the gentleman's construction that the word "owing" refers to the commissioner and not to the islands; but let us see where that leaves us. Now, just exactly what qualification must a Resident Commissioner enjoy that will enable him to comply with these requirements; that is, what must he do to owe allegiance to the United States?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. He does not have to do anything. If he is a resident and citizen of the islands, he does owe allegiance to the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Is the gentleman quite sure about that?

Mr. QUEZON. Unless he is in actual rebellion.

Mr. MILLER. Does he owe allegiance to the Philippine Government?

Mr. JONES. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES. Does the gentleman owe allegiance to the United States Government?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly do.

Mr. JONES. What does the gentleman have to do to show that?

Mr. MILLER. I have taken the oath of office, for one thing, in which I state that I do.

Mr. JONES. The gentleman from the Philippines also has to take an oath of office.

Mr. MILLER. That is after he has been elected, but this says "no person shall be eligible."

Mr. JONES. There is no difference between the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from the Philippines in that respect.

Mr. MILLER. But this says that no person shall be eligible to the office. I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. In line 23 the differentiation there is "who is not a bona fide elector." In line 24, "who is not more than 30 years of age." Line 25, "who does not read and write." You have the expression very clearly in the three lines. Now, instead of saying "allegiance," why not insert "and who does acknowledge allegiance to the United States"?

Mr. MILLER. I think that would be a decided improvement.

Mr. FESS. You have a rhetorical sentence, and one that can not have any ambiguity in it.

Mr. MILLER. I think that would be a decided improvement, but I think there may be some technical difficulty in this language requiring the Resident Commissioner to owe allegiance to two sovereignties. We will assume the sovereignty of the United States extends over the islands, and to that extent he can owe allegiance to the United States and be a Filipino.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the attention of the gentleman from Ohio for a moment and ask him to read again, so that the gentleman from Virginia may hear it, the change in the language that he suggests, and which I believe does make a much simpler and clearer sentence.

Mr. JONES. I do not understand that there is anything before the committee.

Mr. SLAYDEN. There was an amendment offered, I understood.

Mr. FESS. The language I suggested would be "and who does not acknowledge," so it would read:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands and who does not acknowledge allegiance to the United States, and who is not more than 30 years of age, and who does not read and write—

And so on.

Mr. JONES. Let me see in just what line it is.

Mr. FESS. It comes after the word "islands," in line 23. Strike out the word "owing," in line 23, and insert "who does not acknowledge."

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to adjourn. There does not seem to be any business going on here.

Mr. SLAYDEN. We are trying to agree on the phrasing of an amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to offer an amendment, so that there would be something pending.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] offered an amendment. I yield the floor now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] offered an amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I meant to offer an amendment that, after the word "islands," on page 16, line 23, strike out the word "owing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and who does not acknowledge."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 23, after the word "islands," strike out the word "owing" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and who does not acknowledge."

So that the amended lines will read:

No person shall be eligible to election as Resident Commissioner who is not a bona fide elector of said islands and who does not acknowledge allegiance to the United States.

Mr. JONES. What was the language as last modified, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would be willing to put it in this language, "who does not owe allegiance."

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I accept it. The word "acknowledge" does not necessitate going to court.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, will the chairman of the committee kindly take us into his confidence and inform us when he intends to move that the committee rise?

Mr. JONES. We have gone so slowly on this bill that I would like to get along a little further before I make the motion.

Mr. STAFFORD. There are several amendments to this section, and as 5 o'clock is the usual rising hour—

Mr. JONES. Let us offer the amendments to this section, anyhow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] to modify his amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out in line 6, on page 17, the word "four" and insert the word "six" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 6, strike out the word "four" and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

Mr. TOWNER. I will not take any time, Mr. Chairman, in discussing it. The gentleman understands the necessity for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a serious question that is involved in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, as to whether we should lengthen the term of the Resident Commissioners, which is now two years, to six years.

Mr. JONES. It is now four years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Four years as provided in this bill and under existing law?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was under a misapprehension. Even then it is quite questionable whether the same persons, without any right of recall, should be serving in this Chamber for the lengthy period of a six-year term. I know the difficulty that is confronting the chairman and the members of the committee. You have provided for triennial elections, and therefore you would have a hiatus if you provided merely for four years.

Mr. JONES. I was about to ask the gentleman if he was present when we had the discussion over it a day or two ago.



Mr. STAFFORD. I have been present at all times during the consideration of this important bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was willing and the Commissioner from the Philippines was perfectly willing to reduce it to three years, but the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] pointed out that that would not correspond with our terms here, and you have either got to reduce it to two years—

Mr. STAFFORD. You can not make it two.

Mr. JONES. You have either got to put it at six years or make some other change. To leave the term at four years will necessitate the holding of an additional election throughout the islands.

Mr. STAFFORD. It seemed to me that the period was very long for the Philippines to be represented in this body at one time by the same persons without opportunity for a change.

Mr. JONES. I agree with the gentleman about that, but there does not seem to be any other practical way of settling it.

Mr. STAFFORD. When the question was last under consideration the gentleman from Virginia recognized the difficulty that was pointed out by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and I did not know that he had since considered it. But if he has since considered it and thinks it is impossible of correction, of course we are confronted with a condition that has to be met.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to my friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I make this suggestion to the gentleman, that there is nothing in this law regarding the election of Resident Commissioners which provides that they should have seats in this body, nor was there anything in the original law; and so far as I know it was not necessarily in contemplation, at the time the Resident Commissioners were provided for in this organic act, that they should have seats in the Congress. The great bulk of the duties of Resident Commissioners lies elsewhere than in this body, and there is no provision in the rules of the House now that gives the Resident Commissioners seats on the floor of the House. The custom is at the beginning of each Congress to introduce a resolution to the effect that during that Congress they should be admitted to seats in the House and be permitted to participate in the debates. So there will be no danger, I think, about the question of the length of their terms. The great bulk of their duties is not here at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. On second thought, Mr. Chairman, Congress is surrendering, so far as legislation is concerned, its right over many matters and transferring it to the Philippine Legislature as provided for in this bill, and therefore I see that we have a practical condition to meet, and I shall not oppose the amendment.

But in that connection I would like to inquire if the gentleman does not want to follow that up with another amendment, to change the dates here as to when the terms of these Commissioners shall begin and expire? I direct the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are some dates predicated upon a four-year term of office, and ask if that will not have to be changed if we lengthen the time to six years?

Mr. JONES. I do not know of any dates that would have to be changed. The term of office would begin on the 4th day of March following their election. They would be elected in June.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me read to the gentleman:

The Resident Commissioners elected in June, 1915, shall hold their office from the first Monday in the month of December following until the 4th of March, 1919.

That would be for a four-year term. There would be no election at that time, and the term of their successors is to be six years, beginning with the 4th of March following their election. If you follow that up, you will find that there will be no election held in the year following March 4, 1919. That will have to be corrected. I do not know whether you have given consideration to that or not.

Mr. JONES. That would be "1921," I suppose. The other amendment has not been adopted yet, has it, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment is pending, offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER]. The question is on agreeing to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment: Page 17, line 5, strike out "nineteen" and substitute for it the word "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, line 5, strike out the word "nineteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "twenty-one."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. JONES].

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to present some resolutions.

The CHAIRMAN. In just a moment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Now the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a copy of resolutions passed by the Ocala Board of Trade with reference to river and harbor matters.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Ocala, Fla., as to river and harbor improvements.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, we did not hear the gentleman here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I asked unanimous consent to print in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Board of Trade of Ocala with reference to rivers and harbors. They are very short.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 22. That, except as provided otherwise in this act, the executive departments of the Philippine Government shall continue as now authorized by law until otherwise provided by the Philippine Legislature. When the Philippine Legislature herein provided shall convene and organize, the Philippine Commission, as such, shall cease and determine and the members thereof, except the Governor General and heads of executive departments, shall vacate their offices as members of said commission. The Philippine Legislature may thereafter by appropriate legislation increase the number or abolish any of the executive departments, or make such changes in the names and duties thereof as it may see fit, and shall provide for the appointment and removal of the heads of the executive departments by the Governor General, and may provide that heads of executive departments shall have seats in either or both houses of the legislature, with the right of debating or voting or both: *Provided*, That all executive functions of the Government must be directly under the Governor General or within one of the executive departments under the supervision and control of the Governor General. There shall be established by the Philippine Legislature a bureau, to be known as the bureau of non-Christian tribes, which said bureau shall be embraced in one of the executive departments to be designated by the Governor General, and shall have general supervision over the public affairs of the inhabitants of the territory represented in the legislature by appointive senators and representatives.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to submit to this paragraph, but I think it would be better to submit it to-morrow; and I am willing that the gentleman from Virginia should move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FLOOB of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more autonomous government for those islands, and had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FOSTER, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE, for three weeks, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. WATSON, for two days, on account of sickness in family.

#### CHANGE OF CONFEREES.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,  
October 8 (calendar day October 12), 1914.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona was excused as one of the conferees on the bill (H. R. 14233) to provide for the leasing of coal lands in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, and Mr. THOMPSON was appointed in his stead.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER,  
Secretary.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13296. An act for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York; and

H. R. 12161. An act to remove the charge of desertion against John Mitchell.

## ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 13, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting part 2 of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Lighthouses for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, containing, in pursuance of provisions of section 8 of the act of June 17, 1910, a list of purchases made by private contract or in open market, with the reasons for such purchase, during the fiscal year 1914, of materials and supplies for the use of the Lighthouse Service (H. Doc. No. 1174), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DRISCOLL, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 366) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of East River and Hell Gate, N. Y., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1185), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HENRY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19245) for the temporary relief of cotton and tobacco growers of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DENT (by request): A bill (H. R. 19246) to amend section 70 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POUL: A bill (H. R. 19247) to provide emergency issue of bonds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARDWICK: A bill (H. R. 19248) to provide for the issue and sale of the Panama Canal bonds and for the deposit of their proceeds in certain banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 19249) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls to the town of Homestead, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 19250) relating to desert-land entries; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. VAUGHAN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 268) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 369) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 370) authorizing the Secretary of War to use any allotment made under the provisions of an act approved October 2, 1914, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," for the improvement of Vicksburg Harbor at Vicksburg, Miss.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HENRY: Resolution (H. Res. 643) for the consideration of S. 6505, S. 6266, H. R. 19203, S. 6398, and H. R. 15038; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: A bill (H. R. 19251) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 19252) for the relief of James Nolen; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 19253) granting a pension to George S. Salts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19254) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Covert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DERSHEM: A bill (H. R. 19255) granting a pension to Hannah Boyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19256) granting an increase of pension to John H. Condon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELDOMRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 19257) granting an increase of pension to David L. Finch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19258) granting an increase of pension to George O. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TEN EYCK: A bill (H. R. 19259) for the relief of Bridget Mooney; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 19260) granting a pension to Florence D. Hanna; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19261) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AINEY: Petitions of Dr. William Rice, of Rome, Pa., and the Hostetter Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., protesting against tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of T. A. Werble, of Panco; F. J. Strittmatter and wife, of Edensburg; Will F. Gordon and William Sibert, of Hastings; and Goeuner & Co., Fronheiser & Schuster, Elizabeth and Catherine Goeuner, W. W. Campbell, of Johnstown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against war tax on automobiles and auto factories; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Turner Drug Co., of Altoona, Pa., F. W. Jordan, jr., and John R. Doll, of Bedford, Pa., protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALTZ: Petition of various residents of the twenty-second district of Illinois, relative to taxation of mail-order business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Petition of the Germain Lumber Co., of Pittsburgh, Pa., against enactment of legislation preventing the purchase of stamped envelopes with business cards printed thereon; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring House bill 4809, fixing the standard barrel of fruit; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Memorial of the Woman's Party of Cook County, Ill., relative to tax on land values; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRODBECK: Petition of the Stelling Furniture Co., of Railroad; Wentz Bros. & Frey, of Hammer; C. A. Blochee, of Gettysburg; Haflugh & Co., of Philadelphia; and the Farmers' Bank, of McSherrytown, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against bill prohibiting sale of return envelopes by the United States Government; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CAMPBELL: Petition of 40 citizens of Winfield, 1,075 citizens of Pittsburgh, 195 citizens of Cherokee, 202 citizens of Moline, 670 citizens of Parsons, 63 citizens of Thayer, and 1,075 citizens of Cherryvale, all in the State of Kansas, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Local United Lodge, No. 66, International Association of Machinists, protesting against House bill 17890, relative to stop watch in Government departments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. P. Bacon & Co. and the Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce, protesting against tax on grain sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of A. R. Eberle, of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. DALE: Petitions of Hon. James W. Stevens, mayor of Albany, N. Y., and the Chamber of Commerce of Cohoes, N. Y., favoring the establishment of the proposed Government armor-plate plant at Breakers Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of H. Planter & Sons and S. V. B. Swann, of Brooklyn, and the Morgan Drug Co., of Brooklyn and New York City, protesting against war tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the New York State Millers' Association, of New York City, and the Thompson Milling Co., of Lockport, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Moss grain bill (H. R. 17329); to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of S. Glasroff, Alex Gardner, Otto Reubedeetow, the Kings County Pharmaceutical Association, and Charles Killian, of Scales Mound, N. Y., and H. Plantin & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DERSHEM: Petition of 61 citizens of Mifflin, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of the Peter Breidt City Brewery Co., of Elizabeth, N. J., protesting against war tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Jac. B. Zimmermann, of Guttenberg, N. J., protesting against war tax on proprietary medicines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, favoring national department of health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of the Gregory Hood Live Stock Co., of Lancaster, S. C., against tax on automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Standard Drug Co., R. F. Kee, J. F. Mackey & Co., C. L. McManus, the Lancaster Pharmacy, W. F. Laney, the Lancaster Drug Co., I. E. Foster, the People's Drug Co., and E. C. Mackey, all of Lancaster, S. C., against tax on drug business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the National Association of Life Underwriters, of New York, favoring creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Syracuse, Nebr., favoring passage of House bill 5308, relative to taxing mail-order houses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Protest of Arthur T. Vance, editor of the Pictorial Review, of New York, N. Y., against House bill 10238, to amend the copyright law; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, resolutions of Yosemite Tribe, No. 103, Independent Order of Red Men; Rienhold Richter Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans; Alpha Neighborhood Club; Independent Order of Odd Fellows' Military Band; and the Monadnock Tribe, No. 100, Independent Order of Red Men, all of San Francisco, Cal., representing a total membership of 1,146, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill, to pension superannuated Federal civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RUPLEY: Petition of the Wrigley Chewing Gum Co., of Chicago, Ill., protesting against tax on chewing gum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Hostetter Co., of Pittsburgh; W. L. Bucher, of Columbus; and E. Z. Gross and George A. Gorcas, of Harrisburg, all in the State of Pennsylvania, protesting against war tax on drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAUNDERS: Petitions of George W. Whitlow and others, C. B. Dixon and others, and M. J. Compton and others, all of the State of Virginia, relative to personal rural credit bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petitions of 500 citizens of Bentons Camp, Va., and 70 citizens of Houston, Va., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Petitions of 68 members of the First Baptist Church of Colchester, Ill., and 80 members of Cedar Creek (Ill.) Baptist Church, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THACHER: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Chatham, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. THOMAS: Petition of various farmers of Big Reedy, Ky., favoring financial relief for farmers in present emergency; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, October 13, 1914.

(Legislative day of Thursday, October 8, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

## THE COTTON SITUATION IN THE SOUTH.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to present to the Senate this morning a few telegrams and two or three letters. I can, of course, read them myself, but I would prefer to send them to the desk and let the Secretary read them. The first is a telegram from the president of the State Bankers' Association of Georgia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

AMERICUS, GA., October 12, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

If possible, hold Congress in session until some action is taken to provide some relief for the people of the cotton-growing States. The cotton market is now flat and approaching the 5-cent-per-pound level in the interior, with the demand very limited. Imperative something be done. It appears that the governors and legislators of the cotton States can not agree or unite on any plan for relief. The interest of the entire country involved in the threatened disaster to the South. You fully realize the gravity of the situation, and I feel sure will exercise your every effort to obtain relief.

L. G. COUNCIL,  
President Georgia Bankers' Association.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The next telegram I send to the desk is from the editor of the Ruralist, an agricultural paper with a circulation of something like 250,000 subscribers. He is a man of conservatism, and a scholar.

The Secretary read as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., October 12, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Just returned from extended trip over cotton section. Conditions are infinitely worse than press finds expedient to publish. We all fear that unless relief comes through national or United States action horrible conditions will soon develop. Am leaving to-night for Fort Worth, Tex., to attend farmers' national congress in hope of lining up concerted effort.

H. E. STOCKBRIDGE.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The next telegram is from a well-informed resident of a rural section.

The Secretary read as follows:

CALHOUN, GA., October 12, 1914.

Senator HOKE SMITH, Washington, D. C.:

Banks having to push collection. Farmers being compelled to sacrifice their cotton around 6 cents. This spells ruin to many and honest, hard-working families. Many women and children in the South will suffer the coming winter for lack of food and clothing, although no fault of theirs, a guarantee reduction of next year's crop will put price where people can live. Act before it is too late. Quick action is what the South desires and wants. Please hand to President Wilson.

Your friend,

P. M. BOAZ.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD two short letters from farmers. They present the case as it affects the farmer and the tenant farmer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The letters referred to are as follows:

LUTHERSVILLE, GA., October 9, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH.

DEAR FRIEND: Several of my friends have asked me to write you in regard to cotton. Now, you see our condition: We have gone ahead and bought everything this year at a high price; you know, everything was based on 13-cent cotton; now the guano men want us to sell our cotton and pay the money for our guano. Now, cotton is selling for 6½ cents for grade 4 to-day. Now, my guano account this year is \$252.90, so, at 6½ cents for cotton, it will take about eight bales to pay this account. Now, if cotton was selling for 13 cents, like it was when I bought the guano, it would only take about four bales at 13 cents. So it is with everything the farmer bought this year; so when you begin to think about the farmer, he is in bad luck. Now, you see, we farmers depend on our cotton for our money. Now, you see, they are just giving us half price for our cotton; so, you know, if our cotton don't pay our debts, they will take everything the farmer has. You know, they can take the last grain of corn, fodder, and everything that way; the last cow and hog. You know the law gives them that authority. I know the law gives the farmer a chance to bankrupt and homestead; but it is this way with the farmer: Now, if the farmer has got to go to the devil to save his stuff, the farmer had rather see the other fellow take the stuff. I hope it will be so you good men can protect us farmers at once, for we need help at once. The farmers have lost hope, so they are turning their cotton over at these ungodly prices.

Your friend,

LUTHER KEITH.

LYERLY, GA., October 10, 1914.

HON. HOKE SMITH, Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: I received your speech. I tell you, unless something is done to help out the cotton farmer, and that soon, it need not be done at all, for if this cotton crop has to be sacrificed at present prices, the poor tenant farmer is ruined and can not go on to make another crop,